DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 385 SP 003 600

AUTHOR	Kimple, James; And Others
TITLE	Curriculum Change Through Organizational Change: A Human Relations Training Program in a School System.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
GRANT	OEG-68-3566-1
NOTE	128p.; A symposium presented at the annual AERA meeting, Minneapolis, March 4, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.50
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary School Teachers, Experimental Schools, Field Experience Programs, Group Dynamics, *Inservice Teacher Education, Internship Programs, *Laboratory Training, *Organizational Change, *Preservice Education, Problem Solving, Secondary School Teachers, Student Teachers, *Summer Schools

ABSTRACT

This document ccntains three papers describing the South Brunswick Township (Kindall Park, N.J.) Public Schools inservice and preservice program based on a training design which includes group dynamics or human relations training combined with a summer laboratory school. The first paper "A Three-Year Organizational Development with a Total School Staff" describes and analyzes the effects of each phase of the program (1967-70) in a middle school in which teachers participated in an experimental summer school (experimental teaching in the morning; dynamics, planning, evaluation, and skill training in the afternoon) and then in followup activities throughout the school year which included T Groups, problem-solving, and skill training in goal setting, diagnosis, planning, evaluation, and other decisionmaking areas. The second paper describes and analyzes the undergraduate teacher intern program in which future teachers participate in a summer program involving human relations training and teaching in the experimental summer schools and then in a full semester of teaching, consultation, observation, and seminar work on teams composed of interns, teachers, and college supervisor. The final brief paper summarizes system changes and p program innovation, listing changes in curriculum, schools, and personnel. (JS)

ED037385

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CURRICULUM CHANGE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE:

A HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING PROGRAM IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

A Symposium presented at the Annual AERA meeting in Minneapolis, March 4, 1970. The project was supported by an ESEA, Title III Grant #68-3566-1.

ED037385

ED037385

CURRICULUM CHANGE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: A HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING PROGRAM IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PART I: A THREE YEAR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH A TOTAL SCHOOL STAFF

PART II: THE UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER-INTERN PROGRAM

PART III: SYSTEM CHANGES AND PROGRAM INNOVATIONS

INTRODUCTION

When I first became involved with group dynamics nearly twenty years ago, I thought this training might make it possible for a school group to approach their problems in a more systematic fashion. As a consequence over the years we tried a wide variety of training patterns, from 3 day intensive workshops to monthly meetings but were always disappointed with the results. People whom we sent to Bethel for a two week session frequently seemed frustrated at their inability to find others within their school who were willing to take a look at the process of group work.

At that time I was working in a school system where many innovations were taking place. For example in 1953 we developed a voluntary interest, inquiry centered multi-age grouped summer school for youngsters in grades 3 - 12. Some of the programs cut across all age levels.

One of the features of this laboratory school model was the inclusion of college students as teachers' aides. Invariably these young people stated that they learned more in the summer school than in their practice teaching, some also said that they had learned more than they had in two years of college.

Something other than group dynamics created the climate for innovation. Part of the climate was attributable to the fact that each school was granted a high degree of autonomy, part was teacher selection, part was the nature of the community.

Nevertheless, we were convinced that the potential for organizational change through group dynamics and systematic problem solving

was great and all we needed to do was to create an appropriate model.

I think it was 1956 when we hit upon part of the design for the program which we'll be describing today. Al Cohen, now professor at Yeshiva University, Jack O"Rourke, Counsellor, and I, returning from a fishing trip, outlined a program for high school youngsters to be tried the following summer. This program combined group dynamics, individual counselling, group counselling, self analysis of their academic achievement with intensive training in effective writing, thinking and methods of study. Juniors and seniors in high school (my oldest son among them) were completely turned on and although the group met officially from 7 to 11 p.m., unofficially they convened at 6:00 and continued until 2:00 a.m. in the local diner. This was voluntary participation with no extrinsic rewards.

The next logical step was to combine group dynamics and problem solving for staff members with the inquiry based summer laboratory school, providing teachers with the opportunity to work with youngsters in a continuous planning and evaluating process.

Unfortunately we were unable to implement this program after the Board of Education and the Township Committee, in their collective wisdom determined that summer school was not an essential part of a school operation. Ultimately I left and joined the staff at South Brunswick.

In 1962 South Brunswick had an exceptionally fine Board of Education which had defined its role as policy makers. It hadn't always been that way, in fact about ten years ago members of the board were assigned a school for which he was responsible, generally performing

administrative functions. Elementary school principals were little more than errand boys and curriculum decisions were made in the central office. In fact, children in each classroom were assigned to reading groups by the central office.

My purpose in joining the staff was to develop a systematic approach which would change a highly centralized non-responsive school district into a self-generating responsive institution capable not only of responding to but planning for changing needs and conditions while in the process of developing a school program which had meaning for each youngster.

The first step in the process was taken at the first meeting of the administrative group, when schools were made autonomous and principals accountable for program development in their own school.

Freed of central office domination they eagerly set about to do things each had wanted to do for some time. It wasn't long however, before they recognized that if they wanted teachers to change their attitudes and behavior, they had best start with themselves. New skills were necessary for effective leadership which their new found freedom and responsibility demanded.

The Board of Education agreed to send the principals and the superintendent to an N.T.L. training session at Bethel, Maine during the summer of 1963. At the end of the summer we all agreed that the experience had put us ahead about 5 years in our operational procedures.

As a result of this experience, some teachers requested the same opportunity. We reworked the training proposal to which I have already alluded. Dorothy Mial, program director for the National Training

Laboratories worked closely with us.

Funded in 1967 by Title III, we have been able to conduct three years of intensive organizational development work.

The unique feature of the training design include group dynamics or human relations training combined with a summer laboratory school, in which the staff was freed of the normal expectations of parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators as to what school should be. Freed of these expectations teachers were able to concentrate upon solving the problems which existed in a real situation, and able to modify their own training program, their teaching techniques and the programs with youngsters as they found better alternatives.

Previous experience with various summer laboratory school models and training patterns had indicated that a large block of time, at least six weeks, was essential to the success of a summer program. In addition if the summer learning were to be integrated into the regular school program it was necessary to provide ample time for follow-up during the school year.

We'll describe two of the four projects conducted since 1967.

First Fred Nadler, Principal of our middle school and Pete Muniz, Industrial Psychologist, will tell you about three years of work in one school where the total staff has been involved.

Second, Ruth Small, Resource Teacher at Cambridge elementary school and Jean Toth, intern, will describe a unique undergraduate teacher intern program in which these future teachers spend six weeks in the summer and a full semester with us.

James A. Kimple

A THREE YEAR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH A TOTAL SCHOOL STAFF

Frederick F. Nadler
CROSSROADS SCHOOL
South Brunswick Public Schools
Kendall Park, New Jersey

Peter Muniz
LABORATORY FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
NEWARK STATE COLLEGE

Robert E. Chasnoff
LABORATORY FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
NEWARK STATE COLLEGE

This paper was prepared for a Symposium entitled, "Curriculum Change through Organizational Change: A Human Relations Training Program in a School System," at the annual AERA meeting in Minneapolis, March 4, 1970. The project was supported by an ESEA, Title III grant #68-3566-1.

A THREE YEAR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH A TOTAL SCHOOL STAFF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
Organizational Development Concepts Followed	4
THE FIRST YEAR (1967-68)	
Objectives	5
The Summer Program, 1967	5
The First Week	6
Data	7
The Middle Four Weeks	9
Data	11
Table I	12
Table II	13
The Final Week	13
Data	14
A Teacher's Report	18
The Follow-up Program	19
First Follow-up Weekend	19
Data	20
Second Follow-up Weekend	24
Data	25
THE SECOND YEAR (1968-69)	
Objectives	26
The Summer Program, 1968	27
The First Two Weeks	27
The Last Four Weeks	28
Data	29
The Follow-up Program	31
Data	31
THE THIRD YEAR, (1969-70)	
Objectives	34
The Summer Program, 1969	34
T-Groups	34
The Principal's Decision Making Framework	35
Definition of Crossroads Objectives	36
Individual Goal Setting	37
Other Activities	37
Data	37
The Follow-up Program	40
CONCLUSIONS	43

A THREE YEAR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH A TOTAL SCHOOL STAFF

INTRODUCTION

The Crossroads School began service to the Township's 6th, 7th, and 8th graders as the district's only "middle" school in September, 1967. The basic design for its operation was to effect a relevant educational program for the individual pre-adolescent in his transition from the elementary school to the high school. Great emphasis was to be placed on the development of individualized programs for students.

The organization of the school incorporated some aspects of both the elementary "self-contained" classroom organization and the high school single-subject-teacher organization. The basic group was a unit of four teachers, (math, science English, and social studies) and 100 heterogeneously grouped students.

Unit teachers not only were to have a subject area responsibility, but also had to collaborate in the development of selected educational program for each of their 100 students. In so doing, the four teachers were to perform a natural guidance function based on up-to-date appraisal of all aspects of a student's development.

Staff personnel were to help teachers by providing health and library services, consultant help, and direct work with referred students. The administrative team, composed of the Principal, the Assistant Principal, and the Director of Instructional Development, was to coordinate all functions to bring about desired goals.

Individualized programing must be complemented by flexible scheduling. Thus, with the exception of needed schedules for school-wide use

of a common facility, such as the gymnasium, the unit teachers were to arrange and rearrange their own schedules and time sequences throughout any day. Non-unit or special subject teachers were to provide the means for extending a student's program in the humanities fields. They were to share responsibility with unit teachers for a student's overall social and emotional development.

From the time of its inception the Crossroads organization was in an unusual position. It was to be housed in a brand new building, serving children who would come from the various elementary schools. Parents had no prior association with the school and therefore no preconceived notions of its operation. There were no traditions which had to be maintained or revised.

Each staff member on the faculty was asked to accept his position with the expectation of collectively developing a truly exceptional approach to education. It was also made explicit that training would be needed to help the faculty learn how to work effectively so that desired organization goals would be achieved.

For three consecutive years, the total staff has been involved in an Organizational Development Program. Our original program proposal was accepted and funded by ESEA Title III for the school year 1967-68. Each of the succeeding year's program (1968-69 and 1969-70), was founded on the findings and growth of the preceding year. Trainers and consultants from the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science worked with the Crossroads staff throughout the three years.

Organizational Development Concepts Followed

The technology of Organization Development is applicable to any organization in any stage of its life. The O D program is a problem solving approach to an organization's growth. Burke[1] describes the objectives of O D as follows:

1. To create an open, problem-solving climate throughout the organization.
2. To supplement the authority associated with role or status with the authority of knowledge and competence.
3. To locate decision-making and problem-solving responsibilities as close to the information sources as possible.
4. To build trust among individuals and groups throughout the organization.
5. To make competition more relevant to work goals and to maximize collaborative efforts.
6. To develop a reward system which recognizes both the achievement of the organization's mission (profits or service) and organization development (growth of people).
7. To increase the sense of "ownership" of organization objectives throughout the work force.
8. To help managers to manage according to relevant objectives rather than according to "past practices" or according to objectives which do not make sense for one's area of responsibility.
9. To increase self-control and self-direction for people within the organization.

---

[1] Warner Burke, "What is O D?" NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

THE FIRST YEAR, (1967-68)

Objectives

The objectives for the first year, as stated in our Project Proposal for the Title III program, were the following:

> To develop and demonstrate an in-service program for teachers and administrators which will result in significant changes in their classroom practices.

To accomplish this purpose we would attempt to:

1. develop trust among staff members
2. increase sensitivity to the effects of one's own behavior upon others.
3. increase sensitivity to the needs of children
4. free teachers of rigid restrictions imposed by fixed courses of study, inflexible time schedules, inflexible grouping practices and the like
5. help teachers develop skill in goal setting, planning, systematic recording of information and evaluation of learning activities
6. help teachers become more productive team members.

The Summer Program - 1967

The six weeks of the summer training program were allocated as follows:

1 week	4 weeks	1 week
Human Relations training and preparation for summer school.	Experimental teaching during the mornings, dynamics, planning, evaluating, and skill training in the afternoons.	Evaluating, planning, and organizational development

The First Week

The Human Relations Week began with a statement of four goals for this period and a micro-lab. In a series of one-to five-minute sessions. We ran through several exercises in small groups. Focus of the exercises were: feelings at the moment, assessing and capturing expressions about possible problems in working in teams during the summer, giving feedback, rejection and acceptance of group members.

The participants were then assigned to T - groups that we had created by random assignment. The T-group work was quite central during the first week. Typical T-group themes arose such as: authority problems, trust, investment, and "what's this all about?"

Several exercises were conducted for all the participants during the first week:

1. NASA - a group decision-making exercise which helped participants observe their behavior and that of others in group problem solving.
2. Prisoners' dilemma - an intergroup exercise on trust and lack of trust replete with involvement, some "cheating" and significant discussion on intergroup trust, cooperation and competition.
3. Exercises on trust which involved the expression of trust without the use of conversation.
4. A lengthy role play on a possible summer school classroom situation.
5. Use of feedback device known as the Jo-Hari Window. The objective of the exercise was to facilitate giving and receiving feedback.
6. Involvement of teachers as consultants to each other to develop

helping relationships on personal issues and/or teaching problems.

7. Real team work by teams assigned to work together during the summer and school year.
8. Observation of and feedback to teams working in planning sessions. This activity was geared towards developing the ability to give and receive feedback, and provided participants with the opportunity to practice the skill of consulting each other.
9. Simplified input on decision making steps.

Data

Pencil and paper data were gathered by two instruments. The first was a self-other rating scale by which individuals in T-groups rated themselves and all the other participants with respect to amount of involvement and amount of perceived change. Each participant received data regarding how he was perceived by the other members in the T-group. The data show that there were substantial shifts in a positive direction, i.e., comparing the end of the first week to the beginning, most people were seen as participating more, developing better relationships with peers, and demonstrating greater concern for accomplishing group tasks.

The second instrument used during the first week was a questionnaire. Responses showed increase in feeling of trust, increase in feeling of sensitivity of one's effect on others, increase in skill in planning with the team and moderate increase in sensitivity toward children. In the same questionnaire, participants were asked to state some of their reactions to the week's work. Following are some of the comments:

> I have never really considered the idea of trust.
> This past week I have become very much aware of it.

I believe that I am more trusting of others and that I will be able to develop this particular concept in any classroom situation.

I found it very helpful to be able to work with a member of my next year's teaching team. I believe it has enabled us to communicate more freely and honestly.

Proceeding from the unknown to the known has changed me inwardly and outwardly also, I hope. With Saturday's culmination of initial planning in our teaching team, I knew this week has given me the ability to do much better planning with a group. Administrators, individuals, T-group, and team and a lot of soul-searching have made me know I'm never too old to learn and never will be.

I feel that I can better accept criticism about myself. Therefore, it has helped me to form a better opinion about a willingness to work with my fellow colleagues.

I learned some things about myself I could not express before, and I learned much about others. The most "meaningful" experience for me was my T-group and I feel that all members in my T-group are in accord with me when I say this. We have developed a kind of trust and understanding that I did not believe possible to reach. This experience, for me, has given a truer and deeper insight into the definition of "trust." The word now has a new, exciting, and meaningful connotation.

One of the most meaningful and exciting experiences I have ever had. The awareness of others and self, expecially how others receive me or are affected by me, has to carry over and make me a more effective person, hence, teacher. Reacting to a group rather than self. Watching others emerge as fuller or freer persons. Planting seeds for self-awareness and evaluation for betterment. No waste of time at all. Sorry it is over!

It was apparent throughout the week that we were asked to interact, feedback, about a situation, so nebulous that the very result became flimsy.

I am still not convinced these exercises will improve my teaching. It would seem most people are reasonably acquainted with their personality.

> I personally feel very lucky to have participated in this week's activities. I believe these activities have helped me to understand myself and to see how I affect people.
>
> For me, this introductory program gave me a feeling of growing strength within myself - due to an airing of personal weaknesses - along with a greater tolerance of those of others. The sense of personal competition is now gone, having been replaced by feeling of strong cooperation. My next task, as a teacher, will be to break down the unhealthy competitiveness among children and to foster a need for cooperation which we, as adults, have learned.

The Middle Four Weeks

During the mornings of the next four weeks, the teachers taught groups of about 15 children who ranged in age from 9 to 14. The program was relaxed. Often, the groups split into smaller groups following various interests. Sometime, interest groups were formed cutting across the usual groupings. Many groups explored the nearby ponds and collected rock specimens. There was a good deal of art work and outdoor play. Some groups made aquariums from their catches at the pond. Other groups dismantled motors, and one group of boys worked all summer making a racing car. Several groups worked at making rockets and constantly reviewed possible causes for their failures. The teachers constantly inquired, planned, and questioned with the pupils. They used a good many paper and pencil devices to gather feedback on children's reactions. In some classes, tape recordings and video recordings were used.

During these four weeks, the afternoon program had for its focus the inter-dependence of colleagues including trainers, the use of resoures for consultation, team planning, collaborative planning by all of us with respect to the afternoon program, and continuation -- on a reduced

scale -- of T-group work. During this phase of the program, members of the training staff consulted with the teachers. Teachers consulted each other. The collaborative planning was conducted each week with some teachers planning and others observing. There was chaos. There were demands for a "strong leader." There was hostility. But, there was also shared leadership. There was the discovery that problem-solving decision-making steps, presented during the first week, were useful to follow. The importance of stopping and looking at the work processes was also discovered. We created groups to deal with issues that were raised in the course of the summer-school work. Groups dubbed "concern groups" (or C-groups) were created on issues such as safety, the problems of children belonging to one group and not viewing the needs of others in their groups as significant, goals for children, how to evaluate, and how to create greater flexibility.

In the T-groups, the participants role-played, "alter-egoed," and examined their relationships. The "self-other rating form" used during the first week was reviewed and confirmations and disconfirmations of self perceptions were explored. During the T-groups, the participants were also able to express their feelings about the death of one of their colleagues of the summer.

In the afternoon, teams evaluated their work of the morning and made plans for the days ahead. In general sessions, we did force-field analysis of the groups and of individuals. We also demonstrated and discussed a "consultation." During one of the afternoons, teaching teams dabbled in many media and created pictures, diagrams, and totems signifying the spirit of their groups -- and perhaps were loosened up to be more creative about their work.

Data

Data were gathered by means of pencil and paper devices, audio tape recorded interviews, and observations. A skill checklist was used to assess skills teachers felt they needed. This evaluation was conducted in order to use the data for further program planning. A teacher committee tabulated the data from the 16 item checklist. Those skills receiving the highest priority ratings were:

1. helping students clarify own goals.
2. clarifying our professional learning goals.
3. observing recording and feeding back information to adults at work (planning or teaching)
4. communications and listening

In spite of these results there was relatively little work done during the summer on items 1 and 2.

Another method used to evaluate the extent to which the training program objectives were achieved was a questionnaire that called for reactions to the usefulness of different parts of the program. The data suggested that trust had increased greatly. Sensitivity to the effect of one's own behavior on other members of the group was seen as increasing. Teachers reported increases in their ability to set goals, to work productively in groups and to help solve problems in the group. The T-groups were universally reported as most helpful. The program-planning groups, concern groups, and team planning were all evaluated as important but with a wide range of responses with respect to the values derived from them.

Questionnaires were used six times during the four-week period to secure data on teachers' innovative approaches, successful and unsuccess-

ful teaching designs, and descriptions on the teams' working relationships. These evaluations were duplicated and fed back to the teachers.

Evaluation of pupils' reactions were made frequently within the group. At the end of the four week period an evaluation of all pupils' reactions was carried out. The results are summarized in Table I .

TABLE I

Percents of Boys' and Girls' Reactions to Specific Questions about the Summer Program

	All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Not at all	I don't know
1. I was interested	B-37 G-18	B-48 G-63	B-14 G-15		B - 1 G - 4
2. My ideas were listened to	B-19 G-15	B-36 G-15	B-37 G-66	B - 8	 G - 4
3. I made my own choices	B-27 G-29	B-49 G-42	B-21 G-29	B - 3	
4. My teachers were interested in me	B-31 G-14	B-27 G-54	B-19 G-18	B - 1 G - 3	B -22 G -11
5. My teachers did things with me	B-26 G-18	B-45 G-48	B-27 G-33	B - 2	
6. My parents felt the program was a good idea	B-64 G-63	B-17 G-15	B- 7 G- 8	 G - 8	B -12 G - 8
7. My parents were interested in what I did	B-68 G-64	B-17 G-12	B- 3 G-12		B - 2 G -12
8. My parents wondered what the program was all about	B-19 G-11	B-29 G-18	B-26 G-30	B -11 G -26	B -15 G -15

Table II shows results of another questionniare which asked the pupils about the best thing, the worst thing, new things that happened, and things that pupils wanted to do that they did not get to do. This was an open-ended questionnaire. The responses were tabulated into the following categories:

1. A school "subject" or "subjects" as perceived by pupils.
2. A school-type activity, such as, a field trip, pottery

3. Expressions of feelings.

4. Inter-personal relations.

5. Interest, hobbies, not sponsored by the school, brought in by pupils.

TABLE II

Percents of Boys' and Girls' Responses about Best, Worst, New Things and Desired Activities That They Did Not Get To Do

	Academic: Biology: Chemistry etc.		Activity: Pottery, Art Field Trips Cooking		Feeling		Pertaining to interpersonal relations (Friends, others)		Interests: Sports Hobbies I like to do:	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
Best	36	33	27	25	16	15	10	9	19	18
Worst	15	25	7	12	22	37	10	17	6	9
New Things	31	33	49	45	3	3	3	3	10	12
Didn't do-Wanted to	30	53	12	21	5	9			10	17

The Final Week

The focus for the final week was on developing the Crossroads School faculty into an effective working team. Four faculty meetings were held during this week at which time the staff worked on real planning for the fall. The week was introduced by another micro-lab in which we focused on tasks, skills, and human relations as a means of introducing the primary areas which were to be covered during the week.

There was T-group activity and several exercises before the faculty meetings were started. One of the exercises is called the King's Visit. This exercise helped to focus on the question of goals for children in schools. The discussion that followed pointed to the

question of whether teachers should help children to develop as much as possible that which is in them or whether teachers should have certain values defined in advance. We also worked on a task called the Hollow-Square exercise. This task involved the use of planning groups and working groups. Observers later fed in on evidences of frustration, impulsive work, emergency planning, and how well or how poorly people listened.

The faculty meetings began with a rather simple meeting where teachers listed questions and the principal answered those for which he had answers. Other questions were tagged as those which required staff decisions and work began on these questions. Task forces prepared reports on plans for integrating new teachers, school discipline, and curriculum design.

The faculty meetings contained plans for observation and feedback. Trainers and teachers observed. A most dramatic half-hour emerged one day after feedback was given about people's silence during important discussions. The principal asked if silence meant consent. Someone else asked: "does silence mean commitment?" This issue was pressed by the trainers, the principal, and some teachers. We felt that confronting this issue was important because it was in the realm of norms to be followed in future meetings. It was a very helpful confrontation.

Data

An unobtrusive measure of increased skill and improved relationships is seen by the kinds of process comments that teachers made during the course of these meetings. They said things like:

> We're doing here what we did in the Hollow-Square exercise.
>
> I think I'm hearing . . . .
>
> When you started to discuss chewing gum, I turned the whole thing off.
>
> There are a couple of things going on here.
>
> We're falling into splinter groups.
>
> This trust stuff is great until you get close to the task.
>
> I'm feeling anxious.

The training staff also worked with the principal during this final week. Meetings were planned together. The times when he helped the group and the times where he might have helped the group more were discussed. We discussed the issues about his authority, the group's authority, and the central office authority. We thought about times when the total group should work together and when small brain-storming groups would be more appropriate.

Data were gathered during the final week through the use of an open ended questionnaire which appears below with sample responses:

1. The most significant experience to me this summer was . . .

> The feeling of being accepted the way I am and for who I am, and the sense of belonging and being a part of the T-group, the summer program, and the Crossroads faculty. I do not feel that I am simply being paid by an employer, but I've come to feel that I have a stake in the school and in what happens there. It's a good feeling.
>
> The realization that my own character and personality patterns were alienating people I respected and wanted to respect me!
>
> The most significant experience to me this summer was having a group of educators embark upon trying to understand each other. Too often schools are

merely a place to work with no significant interest in the other people who work along side of you. Although, I think our Crossroads faculty will encounter many problems, I believe that they will be a little easier to solve.

The T-groups -- but I can truthfully say that barring a few minor exceptions, I enjoyed every minute of it. It was (the whole program) an interesting, fascinating, and rewarding experience for me -- a 'highlight' of my life and I would like to do more of the same!

T-grouping. Fabulous way to get to know how people perceive you and you perceive yourself. You can have a conversation with someone and not be going around in circles. Verbal and non-verbal communication is constantly coming to the foreground. The skills and learning process procedures were also helpful. They made me more aware of techniques to use in the classroom and skills which I had never acquired.

2. If I were to point to personal changes in me during this program, I would say . . .

That I am a little more honest with myself and more willing to accept criticism from my co-workers.

That for the first time in many years in teaching, I was able to become involved with people. These were not teachers to me, they were people whom I grew to know. I also regained a feeling of importance that I had not felt in recent years.

I know a little more about how others perceive me. Whether I can change my behavior significantly remains to be seen.

I have a broader outlook on ideas and meetings. I am more openminded towards other people -- and I now try to understand and help them. Before, I would stay silent. I also feel more self-confidence.

3. Whenever we tried to plan activities with the pupils . . .

There was trouble at first, there really was no true direction -- the students did not know how to react. After they finally did start on something, they were restless -- then finally they all got interested. After that, the students really planned beautifully with us. They were sensible

and I felt there were good results.

It became apparent that our three team members have different philosophies, use different methods, and have different goals for ourselves, as well as different perceptions of the kid's goals. We didn't work well together, but we had made real progress by the fourth week. Had we continued for four more weeks, we might have made greater strides.

It seems to fall flat because students at this level are not educated in true planning and many times don't know what to plan. We, who have been taught to plan, have a very difficult time. Can you imagine a person with little or no experience?

The children worked well and seemed to understand the process. There was an exchange of leadership in our group of pupils and they appeared to be satisfied with their decisions.

4. I think planning programs for pupils should . . .

Be a cooperative venture. The teachers or team must give the direction but the pupils should be allowed to make choices within a framework. I think pupils should be taught the skills of planning for themselves and in groups -- and then should practice these skills in authentic planning for an authentic purpose.

Not be held until all members of the teaching team have reached a point where they will have trust, confidence, and openness with the other members of the team. Otherwise, no one is satisfied with the results and the team will disintegrate.

5. This coming school year I hope to . . .

Not spoon feed students. To gear a program so they learn and want to learn -- in my subject area. To develop a rapport between my students, me, and the other teachers. To establish a sense of trust -- and keep to it. To work together.

Help the kids get some of the same feelings that I've been getting -- that they're acceptable to me; that they belong; that each one has a contribution to make. I also have a lot of time working to combine these two.

Incorporate those things which I have learned in the summer program. Hope to work closer with my

> teammates and students. Try to be aware of these people's needs and mine also.
>
> Be able to provide individual attention to each child while providing meaningful teaching to the group as a whole.
>
> Become a part of a really new concept of education. I hope that the concept of developing a curriculum based on children's needs will materialize. I hope that the team concept is not interpreted as a means of sublimating individual teacher characteristics into a mediocre functioning unit.

Another way of gaining data, teachers were asked to volunteer to write autobiographical accounts of significant happenings to them during the summer. One of these reports follows:

A Teacher's Report

My thoughts are wondering and an air of unexpected excitement is emminent. What does learning about human relations mean? The first week of T-groups is frustrating. What are we going to do with the children? So many questions.....

The class has been in session for two weeks. I feel that the kind of teaching I was doing was giving me a feeling of security in the way I know best and a rejection and fear of something new. Yet, Iwas doubting my rigid philosophy as being the total theory of this program. I wanted to handle the reading program on a more voluntary and free atmosphere.

An interested trainer, a consultation, a letting loose completely of my goals for the summer, and a concentration on the child and his true needs. Now for a change in classroom procedure. I started things I had made them do previously. At the end of the day, the discussion which evolved between the children and myself, shocked me in a positive way. One girl, very unwilling to talk in the beginning of the program, spoke up rather definitely at this evaluation discussion of the day's happenings. "I like it because you trusted us." I couldn't contain the over whelming sense of accomplishment that welled up inside me. Not that I had done so much for this child, but that I was able to feel an acceptance to the type of process which I rejected so strongly in the beginning. And the most amazing fact came out at the evaluation at the end of the four week program. The children responded favorably to baseball and

phonics games as the best part of the program. Yet, when asked "What did they learn," they all responded with "reading." Wow! What an insight into the meaning and importance of classroom atmosphere.

Personally, this program has opened up many new procedures and things to be aware of about myself. The things I have become aware of about myself, I feel good about. (I chase people away from me by me "formal" attitude.) I find it difficult to be the first one to approach someone new. Probably this formality is my defense in public. I can stand alone and I don't want to be faced with any rejection. I truly enjoy being free enough to say this on paper and aloud to others.

Another awareness that I have felt a certain freedom with, is the skill of checking out situations. I know I am emotional and people affect me more this way than intellectually at first. It's just great to be able to vent negative emotions and clear the air for understanding.

In general I feel that many of the questions and frustrations have been processed and the outcome is a positive attitude. It is a sense of freedom you can't get when you're running away wildly to avoid a situation or person. The more I understand myself, the freer I can be with the children. I'm truly looking forward to teaching this year.

The Follow-up Program

The First Follow-up Weekend

There were three primary objectives for this first follow-up. These were:

1. to integrate into the system those teachers who did not attend the summer program.
2. to increase team (unit) effectiveness in terms of:
    a. improved communications
    b. better planning
3. to improve total school operation in terms of:
    a. teacher-principal work
    b. total faculty work

To enhance the integration of new people into the system, T-group

activity was the major thread during the weekend. T-groups initially consisted of cross-unit members. Later, T-groups were regrouped in order that same unit members could participate in the same T-groups. A major issue during the weekend was a conflict design which was developed around a decision made by one of the T-groups. The conflict forced the entire school faculty to explore some issues which will have impact on them as they form their culture. Some of these issues were:

1. When is commitment to a group decision binding?
2. What is the right of the individual to operate contrary to the wishes of the group?
3. What is trust?
4. What is meant by consensus? Does consensus mean commitment?
5. Does the system form us (teachers) or do we (teachers) form the system? I.e., Do we want to form a flexible system?
6. Where is the line between responsibility to oneself and responsibility to the group?
7. Does one sub-group have the right to assume that their decision will not affect the whole group?

Data

At the completion of the weekend, we collected data by means of an instrument which asked two questions. The questions and some responses follow:

1. As a result of this weekend, what implications do you see as most important in your work?

   I gained a great deal of additional insight, as filtered through my imperfect perception, into my fellow workers. The opportunity to interact with them in a T-group setting afforded my liberties in communication that I feel will carry over to next

Monday and Mondays thereafter. Unfortunately, the T-group is still viewed by myself as an island on which things occur that can't occur on the mainland. To my sincere pleasure I feel that this weekend has brought that island closer to the mainland. I also gained new feelings about the "system" that will allow me to work more freely with groups and individuals.

I see the administration not as a threat, but rather as a resource to me, i.e., I can work without a sense of "Big Brother." I feel the freedom to try new things (if they will facilitate reaching our goals with kids), but also, I feel the responsibility to inform others as to the nature of and reasons for my methods, so that an interweaving of knowledge and trust will envolve.

I received a strong positive feedback (from people I haven't seen for a few weeks) concerning my attempt at changing a few of my behavior patterns. I feel I am working towards improving.

Barriers (hostility, resentment, superiority) were broken down towards my teammate and, in becoming more sympathetic and tolerant, I will be able to facilitate a closer working relationship in our unit. I realized that unless a four-quarter smoothness was in effect, there could be no smoothness, i.e., my concern was not only with my classes but with the classes of my other unit members. Personally, a rapport has been established which previously I had not allowed, thus destroying one of my members. I could have justified my past behavior with the claim of ignorance of my teammate's motives but, having correctly analyzed them in the presence of a T-group, I feel a strong commitment to change my behavior.

I tried, for the first time, to confront someone with whom I must communicate in my work and whom I have not been able to confront before. It was not very successful, but it was at least a beginning, and I now feel committed (?) to continue. The question of acceptance still bothers me greatly. There are people whom I should accept, in order for us both to function better, and whom I cannot. I am nowhere near beginning to resolve this. Acceptance is not so easy when I thoroughly disapprove of what the other person is doing and when I see it as harmful. This is always glossed over in our sessions. I am still hung up on the problem of individual vs group, which needs more thinking and discussion.

I understand my position in the unit much better now that I have been made aware of how the others view me. I feel more secure in the relationships which have developed with the other teachers of my unit and with the others in Crossroads -- teachers in unit, specials, and administrators. I now know I am important to the school and feel more confident in trying out my ideas. By helpful criticism, I feel I will be more aware of my students and of my attitudes toward and handling of them.

I feel I understand myself much better because I've been forced to face myself especially to see how I can improve my relationships with my students and teach more effectively with that knowledge in mind.

I see a more open atmosphere among our unit members to give important feedback. This will give me the help I need in becoming an effective teacher and creating a truly real learning situation for the students of our unit. The people who had not participated in the summer program can now communicate without "fear" of hurting the unit or unit feelings.

2. Please write about an INNOVATION for you this fall, so far, in your teaching and/or administration.

   I am using the techniques I learned this summer in my teaching. In the past I have had some difficulty making the lessons I taught more interesting and meaningful to the children and to me.

   This year I have for the first time honestly tried to give the kids I teach responsibility for their actions. I have not set stringent limits for each class but have rather allowed the limits to be set by the particular class. I am not imposing my particular set of rules upon the class but have allowed each class to develop their own codes of action.

   Actually, the innovation is trying to see whether or not the students analysis of their own needs might be more accurate than teacher analysis of student needs. So far, it has seemed to be effective.

   I am attempting to let the students set and work toward their own goals. They set the ground rules for the year and did so with a maximum of latitude. I steered them in this manner and I hoped that

this is what they would choose. They are now working on projects of their own which I hope they will grade themselves based on my asking basically what they had set out to do, what did they accomplish, and are they pleased with their accomplishments in this light. It is too early to evaluate but some kids are lost at this point and others are doing well. What is surprising to me is this dichotomy is not based on intelligence.

The feeling of freedom that I experience in dealing with students has enable me to feel a total commitment to this school. Knowing that the administration is truly sincere in its desire for innovation has made me able to make innovations. One innovation that I have made is having the children study their group process.

The unit planning that has been going on since the first day of school has taken many forms. The most exciting for me is that which considers an individual child and talks first about his needs and then finds ways to meet them. If they can't be met within the ordinary confines of classroom and school day, modifications of these are sought until at least one possible solution is found.

Until this fall I was a "traditional" teacher who felt the need for a "crutch" -- in the form of a textbook -- and who needed a "quiet" class. My change has been to start group work with "working chatter", i.e., -- the students can talk among their groups, but quietly so as not to disturb others. At this time in their lives (7-8 grades), they seem to need this "freedom" and so far have been working well. Those who need silence find it too, through various ways. I feel with this real working atmosphere, which is not severely and unrealistically silent, the children are working better for me but mostly for themselves.

Working with groups both in the area of interest and level, trying to keep in mind that many children need individual instruction in many areas. In this way I think my students are enjoying the learning situation more than ever before.

Since this is my first attempt at teaching in a subject area, everything has been new. The greatest personal achievement has been the rapid adjustment to the other new members of our team. I feel that this is a direct result of the summer program. It

has been very reassuring to find my trust reflected by them.

Second Follow-up Weekend

For the second weekend lab, the focus was on organizational development with special emphasis placed on a ten-step model of systematic problem solving.[1] The work was mainly cognitive but provisions were made to check out interpersonal relations.

Groups screened then selected real total school problems, diagnosed forces using the forced-field analysis, brain-stormed a wide range of possibilities. Recommendations came from a group of new teachers that a previously principal-imposed schedule be scrapped in favor of a schedule to be created by teachers. The principal agreed.

A Title III Committee was also established during the weekend to sketch out plans for the remainder of the year. At a meeting the decisions that needed to be made were identified, i.e., should there be emphasis on weekend work or observation of teachers or on consultation for administrators or some blending of the three possible thrusts? This was done to help the faculty more to become the managers of the project without in any way withdrawing trainers' interest, support, and willingness to work on these questions collaboratively. In this discussion the dollar constraints were explicitly spelled out.

The total faculty problem-solving consumed the days. Each evening (including the evening before the first day) trainers and administrators worked on clarification of decision-making responsibilities exclusively

[1] Goodwin Watson, "Toward a Conceptual Architecture of a Self-Renewing School System," in Goodwin Watson (ed.), Change in School Systems, Washington, D. C., National Training Laboratories, 1967, pp. 106-15.

for administrators, decision-making responsibilities of teachers, and shared areas of responsibility. It was planned for trainers to supply an instrumented program on decision-making and leadership styles that the staff would be able to follow without necessarily needing an outside consultant.

Data

No formal evaluation of individuals was carried out. Recommendations made by various groups indicated an evaluation of the state of the school as an organization and provided direction for further work. Examples of these recommendations included:

1. How can we develop and/or gather the wide selection of teaching materials and resources needed to effect individualized programs of instruction?

2. Are there ways to help the teacher develop individualized programing such as more planning time and additional help?

3. How can we use T-groups effectively to improve communications, morale, tolerance, and better working relationships among staff members?

4. How can good student discipline be maintained within small groups, the classroom, and the total school?

5. How can teachers and administrators work out a flexible schedule which provides for individualized instruction?

6. How can teachers use each other as resources?

Although the objectives stated for this first year were worked on, and in some cases exceeded, it was evident that further Organization Development work was required. To stop all training and consultation at this point would have prevented the staff from receiving the support it needed to capitalize on the work done during this first year.

THE SECOND YEAR (1968-69)

Objectives

The continuation of the Crossroads Program into the second year had four major objectives.

First, to provide Human Relations Training for members of the Crossroads Staff who had not been involved in the process. This training had the same objectives as the original program. Second, to concentrate upon the development of an organizational structure which would support on-going, self-directing dynamic change. Third, to provide specific skill training for teachers in goal setting, diagnosis, program planning, and evaluation. Fourth, to provide opportunity for staff members to seek solutions to problems of real concern to them and to provide opportunity to try solutions in a summer laboratory school.

As a result of the continuation project, it was anticipated that members of the Crossroads staff would:

1. Apply Human Relations Training to their work with each other and children.
2. Improve decision making and assume greater individual and collective responsibility for decisions and action.
3. Develop a clear picture of the role of the school in the community.
4. Develop effective ways to experiment with use of internal and external resources.
5. More effectively plan and initiate in-service training for themselves both as part of the summer program and for the following year.

6. Identify and use community resources.
7. Increase skills in reporting to parents and involving parents in the on-going educational process.
8. Improve problem solving skills.
9. Develop and use a variety of kinds of materials with children.
10. Develop more professional attitudes, supported by knowledge of a wide range of teaching methods, and research findings.
11. Improve skill in pupil-teacher planning.

During the remainder of the 1967-68 school year, the staff isolated the problems that had not been solved during the year and which required intensive summer work.

In the spring of 1968, students in grades 6 - 9 who attended Crossroads School, were asked to participate on a voluntary basis during the mornings of a three week summer laboratory school. All interested parents were invited to attend a series of meetings in order to clarify the nature and purpose of the program.

The Summer Program - 1968

The six weeks summer training program was allocated as follows:

	2 weeks	4 weeks	
9 a.m. 4 p.m.	Human Relations Training for new teachers. (With other program participants)	Laboratory School Students regrouped each week according to needs defined by faculty	9-12 a.m.
		Organizational Development work 3rd thru 6th week	1-4 p.m.

The First Two Weeks

The first two weeks of a six week summer program for the staff was devoted to a human relations training program for teachers new to

the school and for other teachers who were not part of the 1967 program.

The Last Four Weeks

The entire faculty then participated in a four week program which provided skill-training in goal-setting and work on actual problems defined during the school year. Materials, methods, planning, scheduling procedures and the like were tried with voluntary students during a laboratory school.

1. Materials. The faculty studied a wide range of materials. A collection of materials was started during the previous school year. These materials represented a range from formal textbooks and informally written materials to models of concrete materials. Members of the faculty also studied the professional literature on the use of materials, created ways to evaluate the materials' impact upon pupils, and constructed specific plans for use of these materials in the fall. Consultants were asked to help the faculty develop various materials.

2. Schedules. One of the important issues throughout the first year of Crossroads School's existance had been -- what kind -- if any -- prearranged schedules were needed in a school with 600 pupils. The summer experimental school permitted teachers to construct different kinds of schedules, test them out, and gain data on their effects on the pupils. Similarly, the staff studied the effects of following no pre-designed schedule at all. The staff also isolated certain different logistics problems for study, such as, how to manage the lunch

period. The staff and pupils experimented with various plans, video-taped the pupils' behavior in the course of the various plans, and evaluated the plans based upon a preconstructed set of objectives.

3. Teaching Methods. Teaching methods were studied systematically. Various models were demonstrated by consultants. Methods of instruction designed to implement stated goals were studied. Various ways of teaching were tested and evaluated by the staff.

4. Planning for Individual Pupils. Teachers intensively studied a small group of pupils enrolled in the summer program with respect to their abilities, aspirations, cultural background, interests, self-diagnosis.

5. Curriculum. Plans were made and carried out for the attending pupils. Data was processed with respect to pupils' perceptions of the impact of the curriculum plans on themselves.

Similarly, other areas of concern were identified and studied such as the report to parents system, community relations, pupil-teacher planning, use of internal and external resources, integration of subject matter areas, and decision-making clarification.

Data

Data were gathered through the use of a questionnaire which was administered before and after the summer program. The results showed a significant change in attitude toward the school, as well as the growing maturity of the Crossroads organization.

The following were typical responses to a request to "Briefly

comment on your feelings about the summer program."

Many of the concerns of last year were resolved.

It did much to reduce the confusion and anxiety I was feeling.

The table of organization has been more clearly defined.

Would have been more beneficial to have had more of an opportunity to T group.

I would have preferred more individual and unit work.

I feel more sensitivity training was necessary.

Gave me a different view of students which will enable me to work better with them.

It did much on clarifying my thinking on the role of the administration.

The administration has changed its role.

Became more knowledgeable of others.

Did little to change my views of others.

Developed a better feeling towards entire staff.

Eliminated many of the concerns experienced last year and will allow the school to function more effectively this year.

I feel that I am at point now that would have not been achieved until Nov. or Dec.

I gained a better understanding of the complexities of operating a school. Our accomplishments during the summer will enable us to function more effectively this school year.

In responses to the open-ended question, "The Most important part of the summer program for me was . . . ." all participants showed acceptance and reliance to Human Relations Training, Organizational Development work, or both as shown in the following:

30% stated H.R. Training
52% stated O.D. work
18% stated some combination of HR and OD

The Follow-up Program

Considerable time was provided for teachers to work on self-identified problems and to participate in total staff-identified problem oriented projects. Most of these problems and projects were a continuation, a clarification, or an implimentation of the results of those topics developed during the summer. In addition provision was made for the employment of consultant services during the course of the school year.

Data

Some of the more significant accomplishments listed by participants which took place during the follow-up were:

1. Additional HR work was done to help overcome staff communication problems. Espirit de Corps problems, and a seeming lack of understanding "the way it is" for the other guy.
2. A procedure for programing special activities was developed for Special Education Students.
3. A school-wide Interest Activities program for all students was developed.
4. Role descriptions were begun for every position at Crossroads through a system of self-analysis and group development.
5. The development of a pilot Unit Core-Curriculum Program was begun with an aim of integrating various subject areas.
6. The development of programs in Narcotics Abuse Prevention and Sex Education were begun.

An overview of the work accomplished during the entire second year shows that high priority was placed on specific problem oriented projects which when completed, would help the organization function. Some of the more significant of these projects were:

1. Defining and clarifying the decision-making process as follows:

In the South Brunswick Township Public School System, decision-making at the school level is directed by the building principal. He is charged with the responsibility of the actions of all people in his building and the necessary authority is delegated to him to carry out this responsibility. His authority allows him to select a leadership style which can vary from making all decisions to delegating authority to others for all decisions.

At Crossroads School the principal has established the following decision-making procedure:

The Principal will decide which of the following three procedures will be used.

I. Principal
   1. Gather available information and decide
   2. Appoint Advisory Committee to:
      A. Gather information
      B. Formulate solutions
      C. Present best solution
      D. Principal decides

II. Committee
A representative committee is commissioned by the principal.
Action Procedure to be followed:
1. Gather all information
2. Formulate possible solutions
3. Select and present best solution to all for reaction
4. Consider reactions for solution revision or rejection.
5. Committee decides by consensus.

III. Group
The group is defined as all those personnel affected by the decision. Group decision-making will follow one of these methods:
1. Establish an Advisory Committee
2. Establish a committee to decide.
3. Send matter back to principal for his decision.
4. Group vote - majority.
5. Group consensus.

Just as the decisions made by the principal in the first instance are binding on all, the decisions made by the committee are binding on

all, including the principal. A group decision is also binding on all.

In a group decision, the group first has to determine which method or action will be followed. This is done by consensus or simple majority vote. The principal participates as an individual group member.

2. A three-phase curriculum development project was initiated.
3. The 1968-69 Parent Reporting System was developed which included forms and procedures to be used.
4. A committee, composed of six teachers, developed a more flexible master schedule which allowed better implimentation of the school philosophy.
5. A Parent-Student Handbook was developed.
6. Through use of consultants, teachers learned about the skills involved in teaching for thinking.
7. Group-dynamics work continued with emphasis on identifying and learning about the various intellectual, interpersonal, and emotional roles of group members.

THE THIRD YEAR (1969-70)

Objectives

Planning for the 1969 program started with a data collection phase. The Administrative Team, composed of the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Director of Instructional Development, was interviewed. The major focus was on problems facing the organization, issues with which they wanted to deal, and objectives for the Summer training program. The entire staff completed questionnaires and most of the teachers were interviewed in groups. A group of students was also interviewed.

The following broad objectives for the two week summer program were developed from the questionnaires and interviews:

1. To improve Crossroads as an organization.
2. To improve the working skills of the units.
3. To improve and develop teaching skills.
4. To improve problem solving and decision making skills.
5. To improve the ability to give and receive help.
6. To improve the ability to share information and feelings.
7. To improve the organization's ability to absorb new staff members.

The Summer Program, 1969

The Crossroads faculty were able to work as a group for a two week period in August, 1969. A variety of activities were used to accomplish the aforementioned goals.

T-Groups

The faculty was divided into three T-Groups. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Director of Instructional Development served

as leaders. One trainer worked with the entire staff. He spent time with each group. The following objectives were stated for the T-groups:

1. To help new members acquire T-group skills and norms.
2. To have old members help new members acquire these skills.
3. To have old members "brush up" on these skills.
4. To set norms for a greater use of these skills during the school year.

The focus of the T-groups was to be Organization Development. It was stressed that the T-group activity was justified only to the extent that it improved working relationships. Explanation was given to emphasize the O D aspect of a T-group and de-emphasize the "personal growth" type of T-group. It had been recognized that the "personal growth" experience was not accepted by several teachers. This apparently had blocked these teachers from recognizing the utility of T-group norms in an organization. After the explanation, several teachers stated that this was the first time they were able to understand and accept the T-group activity within an organizational setting.

The Principal's Decision Making Framework

A design was developed to test the teacher's understanding of the principal's decision making framework (see Page 31). The principal explained his decision making policy. He then presented three issues to the T-groups. They were asked to consider themselves to be the principal and their task was to decide which decision making procedure would be used to solve the three issues presented to them. They were also to develop the rationale for their choices. The administrative team formed a fourth group and worked on the same task. In a general

session, each group presented its decision and rationale. At the end, the principal presented his decisions for each issue. In most cases, the principal and the three groups agreed. The task helped greatly in achieving faculty understanding of the principal's decision making policy. Some dividends derived from this session were: people demonstrated empathy for the principal - this was noted by the trainer from the discussions in the three groups during the group work on the task. Also, during the general session, the individual representing one of the groups started a hostile, highly defensive argument about interpretation of the decision making policy. A highlight of this discussion was that the teacher who was arguing with the "Principal" representing one of the groups, was able to process his behavior and recognized that this was exactly what he often did with the principal and others during faculty meetings and discussions.

Definition of Crossroads Objectives

During the first two years there was a lack of clarity regarding Crossroads School objectives. Although the faculty knew the fundamental philosophy at the school (individualized instruction) and the functions of the unit structure, the operational objectives were never clearly defined. This led to confusion and the playing of intellectual games around such words as traditional,individualized instruction, competency, creative, innovative, inquiry method and ungraded. The ambiguity encouraged defensive behavior among the staff. Another factor contributing to the ambiguity was the lack of clarity surrounding performance appraisal. During the two week Summer program, the principal stated and defined the Crossroads broad objectives and defined many of the words

which were being used as weapons by the faculty.

Individual Goal Setting

On the last day of the two weeks, the entire staff participated in a self-evaluation and goal-setting session. Each member constructed a force field analysis using self development (personal and professional) as the focus for the force field. Each person met with two others to receive feedback and help on his analysis. Each person then developed a goal or set of goals for himself for the coming year. These goals were then checked against criteria for goal setting.

Other Activities

Time was set aside for individual and unit work. In addition, groups worked on tasks assigned by the principal. The tasks involved problem solving, planning, implementation, and development of short and long term objectives. During these work periods, the groups were asked to complete "group process" questionnaires. The groups were to discuss their answers to the questionnaires as an aid in processing how they worked on the task. It was stated that the questionnaires were meant as aids during the two weeks and as potential tools which they could use during the school year.

Data

The staff completed questionnaires at the end of the first and second weeks. The data collected are too extensive to be reported here. Reaction to the two weeks was positive. A series of items on the final (second week) questionnaire required that the respondents write, in their own words, the objectives of the two week program and then to

(1) indicate the degree to which the objectives were met, (2) Relevance of each objective to the individual (as a teacher), and (3) Relevance of each objective to the Crossroads school. Responses for these three were indicated on scales of 1 to 9 (1 = low, 9 = high). The objectives listed by ten or more persons were:

1. To develop "group process" ability, committee work, cooperation.
2. To clarify decision-making roles, how to make decisions, decision-making skills.
3. To work on functional program, O D work, develop procedures.
4. To set climate, improve working relations, Human Relations skills, self understanding.
5. To accomplish specific tasks for school opening day.
6. To learn ways of working, philosophy at Crossroads.
7. To integrate new people, unite staff, find a place for self, clarify intern role.
8. To set goals and ways to evaluate goals.

On the scales for achievement of the objectives, and relevance of the objectives to themselves and to Crossroads, the majority of respondents checked five or higher.

One question was open-ended. It stated: "Based on the past two weeks and what I know about Crossroads, this is what I predict for the coming school year. . ." This was a way of obtaining a prognosis from the faculty. Following are some of their answers:

> A better working faculty. They know more what is expected from them - further direction from administration. Looking forward to a great year.
>
> Units will begin with great gusto with interns

feeling a real part of the action. Faculty spirit will be good and high for several months. However, without any tasks or whatever to make the faculty look at itself as a close unit the total-group spirit may dwindle and the interworking of people to people resources may dwindle.

I feel that as a unit we will work together in order to have the best possible results. I also see it as a cooperative thing between units.

I predict a situation in which these principles and ideas preached will be practiced.

Units will tighten but will make attempts at communication with other units; faculty will try to work together better.

A well rounded, good communicating faculty that will be open and concerned with others.

I expect to learn a lot, to try many different things, and form a more specific teaching philosophy.

If the norms of T-grouping and clinicing are maintained I see a very fruitful and productive year ahead. In any event, I see a better understanding among the faculty, of one another and of the administrators. I think the idea of randomly using labels and terms might be avoided or more carefully placed.

More efficient functioning. Good spirit. More openness on the part of the new staff. I feel that the blending of new and old staff was accomplished much more effectively this year and there will be better functioning of staff because of it.

Basically a good working year. Some problems, but none that are insurmountable due to the framework that has been set up during these two weeks.

I think we'll work hard and make great strides towards fulfillment of our goals. They are clearer than they were last year and more people are committed to achieving them.

There may be some personality conflicts across units, departments and specials about schedules. The overall attitude is good. I feel it will be a good year for my unit, for my department, and for my school, and for me, too!

> A faculty that will be better able to use the decision making processes and other group processes. Also, a faculty that will be united beyond the individual units.
>
> A highly stimulating experience for myself and a climate in which I can (as a new teacher) get my 'feet wet' without fear of getting severely criticized by administrators.
>
> Closer, more open faculty. A smoother running school due to more direction and clarification from Fred (Principal). By far, the most successful year is coming.
>
> Predictions are easy to make. I hope I will change and adjust to the philosophy of Crossroads

The following "comments" on the same questionnaire, indicate additional feelings about the two weeks:

> Suggestion. A few Title III weekends this year. Hats off to a rewarding two weeks.
>
> Two outstanding weeks in my professional life.
>
> I am very satisfied with what was accomplished here in the last two weeks; am very optimistic about the coming school year; am very impressed with the entire faculty of Crossroads.
>
> I think these two weeks and the six weeks preceeding it (another summer program in South Brunswick) have been the most worthwhile experience of my education. I have done some deep soul searching and gained a keener awareness of myself and am constructively working on diminishing and/or eliminating my impeding forces for my development as a person and as a professional.
>
> These two weeks were of great value to me.

The Follow-up Program

On September 30, 1969, the Administrative Team and the consultant met to plan the school year follow-up activity. The Principal stated that he had five items uppermost in his mind and wanted to place these

in rank order as a way of planning the follow-up. The five items were ranked by us as follows:

1. To develop a performance appraisal procedure.
2. a. To clarify the relative importance of the various aspects (subjects, individual growth, counselling, etc.) which are considered in the development of programs for children.
   b. To develop and improve teaching skills. (This was stated as an objective during the two-week summer program but was not achieved).
3. To maintain the communication norms (openness, trust, etc.) that were reinforced during the two week program. It was decided that this objective could be enhanced by the way the Principal worked on items 1, 2. a., and 2.b.
4. To decrease the basic insecurity of teachers. It was felt that work on the first four items would help achieve this objective.

Development of a performance appraisal procedure seemed to be the key to the other items. It was felt that a performance appraisal procedure would automatically take care of items 2a and 2b. The work accomplished, decision making and discussions would serve to maintain communications, and a side effect of the performance appraisal system would be an increase in teachers' feelings of security because the method developed would clarify the appraisal system - an important source of teacher insecurity. So far, the Principal has had three meetings with faculty members. The principal's stated objective is: "to initiate a project designed to clarify and improve the present evaluative procedure, and to develop and impliment alternative methods."

Factors and research being considered are: organizational goals, personal goals, teaching skills, professional growth, contribution to the organization's goals, coaching, self-evaluation, and management by objectives. At the time of this writing it is not clear what form the appraisal procedure will take. One thing is clear, however, the initial steps have been hampered by difficulty in defining job objectives, teaching objectives and developing criteria for teacher evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

The Title III program at Crossroads appears successful - if one is to measure success as being the development of an organization which is constantly reviewing and solving the problems it faces, improving its ability to solve problems and make decisions, and continually developing its human relations skills.

In conclusion some of the learnings to come from the Crossroads experience are as follows:

1. The three years were a classic client-consultant history. Each year can be categorized into three client-consultant relationships.

   The Dependent Phase. Although there were many instances of collaborative planning between client and consultant during the first year, the major thrust during the summer program was provided by the trainers.

   The Counterdependent Phase. The summer of the second year was the start of this phase. The principal told the superintendent and consultants that the program would be conducted with very little help from consultants. The training staff did not attempt to intervene and suggested to the principal that they (trainers) would be available if called upon. (Several consultants were working in other programs within the school system).

   The Interdependent Phase. This phase was ushered in during preparations for the summer, 1969 program. Interdependent, collaborative planning between client and consultant

characterized this phase. Since the planning of the 1969 Summer program, a consultant has worked with the principal, assistant principal and Director of Instructional Development. The principal decides on his own, what he plans to do and when to call on the consultant. This had led to a beneficial and meaningful helping relationship between client and consultant.

2. The organizational philosophy must be stated and restated in clearly defined, operational terms. Anything less leads to ambiguity, unnecessary conflict and defensiveness. During the interviews conducted before the 1969 Summer program, one of the teachers said: "We preach the philosophy, but do we really know what we're talking about?" The statement of Crossroads broad objectives during the 1969 summer program served to diminish ambiguity regarding the school's philosophy.
3. Community and parent involvement should be included during the first year of this type of program. Much anguish caused by community and parent confusion and hostility would probably have been avoided had we included greater community involvement.
4. The need to develop teaching skills required to meet the school's organizational objectives cannot be overlooked. Not only must teachers be helped to acquire new skills - they must be helped to overcome the many barriers resulting from their own prior school experiences - which includes their experience in college.
5. When an organization is undergoing training in shared problem solving, de-emphasizing the chief administrator's role must

be avoided. During the first year, shared problem solving was emphasized to the point where some of the faculty began to lose sight of the prerogatives that the principal wanted to reserve for himself. This led to the need for clarifying the decision making roles of the principal and staff. While this was attempted by the Principal during the first year, the procedure was not completely understood until the third summer (1969). There are still some faculty members who feel that the principal must share all decisions with the faculty.

6. The need for prior work in Management Development for School Administrators is apparent. If the principal had had a working knowledge of such concepts as Leadership Styles, the Organizational Development Process, Problem Solving, Motivation Theory, he would have been equipped to participate in the First Year planning in a more effective manner.
7. There is a need for an intra-system dissemination of information. All other school organizations in the district should know what is happening at Crossroads. An effective job has not been done here.
8. In a system operating on such norms as trust, openness and feedback, the problems, gripes, annoyances are more readily expressed than in a closed, highly defensive organization. This often places a greater burden on the administrators and faculty.
9. Work on real tasks and processing of group work sessions must be deliberately integrated throughout concentrated training

sessions. The importance of processing the group's work sessions was not accepted until the third summer! Also, trainers should de-emphasize "opening" and "closure" of concentrated training sessions so participants don't separate these sessions from on-going school activity. Separating the training from the school activity can result in little or no transfer of the training sessions to the day-to-day school activities. For example, there were instances when people at Crossroads were holding feedback until they could express this feedback in a Title III training session!

10. If benefits are to be derived from a concentrated off-day or summer training program, constant reinforcement must be provided during the school year and as long as the organization requires help.

11. During the training sessions, teachers cannot help but develop experiences for their classes that are similar to the designs used by the trainers. This can be a good method for teachers to improve their skill, provided they do not attempt to use training designs which are beyond their ability to adequately meet the objectives of the design.

12. At Crossroads, some teachers are still questioning the legitimacy of T-grouping and T-group norms in an organization. This leads us to conclude that from the outset of training, T-groups should be oriented towards Organization Development, rather than personal growth.

13. The structure of an organization can contribute to communications barriers. This occurs at Crossroads because of the

"unit" structure. There are two choices open to the organization: (1) to eliminate the "unit" structure (although we know that there are advantages to this concept - such as - greater possibility for individual attention to the child), or, (2) to maintain the current organizational structure, identify areas which are causing faculty fractionization, and work towards eliminating or diminishing the effects of those factors which are serving to undermine communications among the groups in the organization. Feedback indicates that the training programs served to re-establish communications in the organization but the pressures and activities during the school year can recreate the barriers to communications.

THE TEACHER-INTERN PROGRAM

By

Robert Chasnoff
Marie Sainz
Jean Toth

Newark State College
Union, New Jersey

Patrick Garzillo
Richard Shurtleff
Ruth Small

South Brunswick Township
Public Schools
Kendall Park, New Jersey

This paper was prepared for a Symposium, "Curriculum Change through Organizational Change: a Human Relations Training Program in a School System," at the annual AERA meeting in Minneapolis, March 4, 1970. The project was supported by an ESEA, Title III grant #68-3566-1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	PRE-SUMMER PREPARATIONS	2
II.	THE TWO-WEEKS OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND THE TASK OF PREPARATION FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER SCHOOLS	4
	The Human Relations Training	4
	The Task	5
	Participants' Reports	8
III.	THE FOUR-WEEK EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER SCHOOLS	14
	The Program	14
	Reports Gained at End of First Week	17
	Reports Gained at End of Second Week	19
	Reports Gained at End of Summer	25
IV.	THE FULL-SEMESTER TEACHER-INTERN TEAMS	34
	End of the Semester Data	36
V.	DISCUSSION	51
	On Achievement of General System Goals	51
	On Specific Organizational Training Program Objectives	53
	Participants Recommendations for Changes	56
	Implications for Pre-service Teacher Training and In-service Training	61

THE TEACHER-INTERN PROGRAM

For two years, Newark State College seniors have been treated as staff members in the South Brunswick, New Jersey schools for a six-week summer training program followed by a full semester of internship in the schools. By means of an organizational development program, teachers and interns were helped to create a climate that permitted productive work toward the system's goals as well as teachers' and interns' individual goals.

A description of the second year of the organizational development program is presented in this paper. The program consisted of the following segments:

I. Pre-summer preparations.

II. Two weeks of human relations training and the task of preparation for the experimental summer schools.

III. The four-week experimental summer schools.

IV. The full-semester teacher-intern teams

An account of each segment of the program is presented, followed by a description of the data gained during or at the end of each segment.

I. PRE-SUMMER PREPARATIONS

Prior to the start of the summer program several meetings were held by various personnel who were to participate in it. In the spring of 1969 a meeting was conducted by interns from the previous year to introduce prospective interns to the program. The prospective interns

then spent a day touring the South Brunswick school system. They had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the program with the Newark State College supervisor and both South Brunswick project directors. At that time, each prospective intern was asked to draw a picture of himself in a classroom and to make arrangements to record an audio tape of himself working with children.

The South Brunswick project directors, an NTL Institute trainer, and the college supervisor met with consultants who were specialists in mathematics, science, creative use of sight and sound, and creative dramatics. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss alternative ways in which the consultants could participate in the summer program. It was decided that the consultants would confer with teachers and interns and would participate on the basis of the clients' needs.

A meeting designed to develop objectives for the program was held. At this meeting, the NTL trainers, the college supervisor, and a South Brunswick project director reviewed the Title III proposal. Out of this meeting emerged a design of working goals for the program. General goals were:

1. for teachers to improve their teaching,
2. for interns to learn to teach,
3. for pupils to attend good summer schools,
4. for an organization to be created so that these goals might be accomplished.

Specific organizational objectives were also defined. It was hoped that a culture could be created so that participants would:

1. develop congruance between theory and practice,

2. increase skill in identifying and evaluating one's strengths and weaknesses,

3. develop skill in goal-setting,

4. increase openness,

5. increase skill in the use of resources.

II. THE TWO-WEEKS OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND THE TASK OF PREPARATION FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER SCHOOLS

The Human Relations Training

The two-week human relations (HR)program was participated in by interns, cooperating teachers, and the college supervisor. At the initial general session the participants were informed that the first two weeks of the program were viewed as the beginning of the process of getting ready for the task of the next four weeks -- that of conducting two experimental summer schools.

The general goals were reviewed. The specific organizational objectives were introduced. T-groups were then created at this general session with the 72 participants sitting in role groups, the teachers according to schools they were from and prior experience in training programs and the college supervisor and the interns. Participants counted off and became part of the groups established in this way. The t-groups operated rather independently of each other for several days, going through the usual confrontations, questions of belonging, and development of group culture, aided by trainers' interventions suggesting verbal and non-verbal exercises.

The Task

At a general session on the fourth day, the participants were reminded that they had the task of conducting two four-week experimental schools. In these schools, according to the Title III proposal, teachers and interns would explore experimental ways of teaching children. As a staff they would have to decide upon their own learning objectives, pupils' objectives, ways that decisions would be made, how materials would be gotten, and other nitty-gritty details involved in conducting schools. It was suggested that the total group reconvene the following day with preliminary reports.

An observer at this session described the reactions to these instructions as follows:

> At first nobody went anywhere. They sat in their own groups, looking around at the other groups, talking tentatively together. I listened in on one group. They were arguing priorities. Where should they start -- planning student-teacher ratio? Outlining a curriculum?
>
> A young man who had been drumming his fingers abstractedly while the group wavered got out a pad and pencil. "Look," he said, "we have till tomorrow at 11. We need to start somewhere. Let's start by listing who wants to teach reading and who wants interest groups."
>
> A boy said, "Why don't I go around and see what the other groups are doing?" He was beaten out by a girl spy who came around to see what our group was doing.
>
> The monotone of the conferring groups was broken by a pretty girl in a white tennis dress and an orange headband who marched to the center of the room and announced: "Listen everybody. This is an exercise in frustration. They aren't really going to let us make a plan. We're forming a new group -- the bullshit group. Anybody who feels frustrated join us." She walked back to her corner and sat down on a blanket on which her fellow dissidents had inscribed, with felt-tip pen, "bullshit." About five people left their original group and joined them.

Meanwhile, one group had quietly left the gymnasium and shut themselves up in an empty classroom. They would let me come in, but they wouldn't come out.

"We're rebels," a little girl with dark hair and big eyes said. "We don't want to be out there. We want to be by ourselves."

There were eleven rebels--ten girls and a boy. "Our group is really close now," the boy explained. "Monday we were just eleven people who didn't know each other. We've been T-grouping for four days. But just since this morning we've been open, really open, with each other."

He looked around for confirmation. "Oh, that's right," said a girl with blond braids. "You should have been here this morning. We all cried and passed the tissues."

"It's like," said the girl with the braids, "if Joe said shut up to me on Monday, I'd be mad. But now if he said it, I know he means, 'Shut up, I love you.'"

Everybody nodded solemnly.

"So you see," said the first girl, "now that we're really communicating, we want to stay here. They keep coming and trying to get us out, but we're not ready to join the big group yet."

. . . Back in the gymnasium, I discovered that a new political coalition had formed. The dissident group had gotten off its blanket and joined one of the groups in the center of the room. The girl who had led the insurrection was, I noticed, now established as leader of the new coalition. At least, doing all the talking.

I went back to my original group. They had abandoned efforts at overall planning, I discovered, pending the outcome of the power struggle in the main area. They now saw their function as creative, and they were excitedly brainstorming up ideas for creative writing courses. . . .[1]

---

[1]Marilyn Mercer, Sensitivity training: what happens when it goes wrong--and when it goes right? Glamour, 25: 184-85, February 1970.

After the éclat of the first day of concern for the summer schools, some t-groups began to design what might be called a traditional school program and were mainly concerned with who would be the principal. Other groups began by asking themselves questions such as "What is it we want to be able to do or know by the end of the program that we do not know or are able to do now?" As a result, the latter groups began to write objectives. Trainers were used to help with the technologies of goal-setting and organization.

As t-groups vied with each other on whether to decide first upon who would be the principal or whether to define goals first. The controversy between groups created conflict. Trainers were asked to help. Resolutions of the conflict were made by means of conflict utilization technologies and plans for the summer schools proceded.

In a general session in the second week, participants were introduced to the previously mentioned consultants. Each consultant briefly told of or demonstrated his area of interest and competency. Informal voluntary meetings were then held to explore further how consultants might be of help during the four-week segment of the program. Specific initial appointments were made.

At the culmination of the two-week introductory segment, the training staff assisted the teachers and interns chose their own temporary summer teaching teams. This was done by having the interns and cooperating teachers "mill around" and interview each other, share their goals for the summer, and decide whether or not they would make a feasible working team.

Participants' Reports

Reports on self and others. A Self-Other Rating Form was administered at the beginning and near the end of the first two weeks. Four sections of the form contained items with respect to four dimensions: Relationship to Group, Relationship to Individual Peers, Relationship to Task, and Relationship to Me. The participants were asked to rate their perceptions of each person in terms of how they viewed this person early in the history of the t-group and how they viewed this person at the end of the t-group's history. The instrument had a 7-point scale, with 7 as high. Means of the thousands of judgments are indicated below:

	MEANS	
	Before	Now
Relation to Group	3.60	5.40
Relationship to Individual Peers	3.70	5.08
Relationship to Task	4.44	5.70
Relationship to Me	3.71	5.12

The data have not been subjected to an intensive analysis. However, an unsophisticated look at the figures above suggest that people were perceived as changing.

General Impressions of the t-group. At the end of the two-week HR and preparation period described above, the participants were asked to fill out an open-ended questionnaire intended to gain reports in their own words of their experiences. The items dealt with general impressions, outstanding event, major disappointments, and major learnings. The

participants' responses suggest that there was movement in the direction of the more personal program objectives.

The first item on the questionnaire at the end of the HR and preparation period was the following:

> In the space below please indicate your impressions of what went on in your group during the first 2 weeks. Think of this as a kind of thumbnail sketch of your t-group.

Both interns' and teachers' responses ranged from comments like "nothing was accomplished" to comments like "people learned to be honest." Between these poles were descriptions of "not knowing what was expected at first," "conflict," and "getting together." However, the overwhelming report was that the two weeks were highly productive for building trust and for becoming more open. Two rather typical responses are reproduced below. They suggest an increase in openness, one of the program objectives.

> It was difficult to get to know others. Exercises were interpreted as games. We became aware of masks and shields we hid behind. First impressions kept changing. Concerns with trust and tricks. Friday breakthrough. Work towards goals. Learn to ask for help. Work with other T-groups. Avoid mass organization. Video tape session interesting--not everyone wanted. Conflict, division. Confrontation of problem. Work in large groups planning for 4 week session.

> I think some people attempted to express inner feelings after they found out what this was all about. I feel as if we grew in trusting the group. I also feel that some people saw themselves in a different light. I feel that a lot of the people got to know each other and tried to understand the needs of each. I also feel that a form of loyalty to the group grew. I feel that the people in my group became more aware or sensitive to other people as well as to the people in our group. I feel that some stop and consider feelings of others now.

Yet the responses sound realistic instead of highly charged with infatuation with the t-group process and with the people as we frequently find in reports of these kinds of experiences.

> In the beginning, the group was composed of uncertain individuals each regarding the others as either a threat or just indifferent. As we proceeded to discuss personal feelings we became aware of each other's fears and expectations. The turning point, (I feel) came after we split into sub-groups and probed personal experiences and feelings. After re-assembling into a large group, we (as a group) were able to share and better understand each group members' feelings. It was this point we ceased to function as individuals and began reacting as a group. From there we have continued to grow and strengthen our relationships to each other and with the group as a whole. Each day we have continued making progress and evaluating our failures and successes (as a T-group) in a more realistic manner.

Outstanding event. Item 2 on the questionnaire was:

> Give a brief description of what you considered to be the most outstanding event in these first two weeks. What we are interested in is the one event that made the biggest impression on you.

The outstanding event was described mostly by teachers and interns as episodes which induced "letting defenses down," and "openness." Other responses told of events which led to "greater awareness of other people," "progression from conflict to closeness," "learning how to deal with conflict," and "group feeling." Some characteristic comments were:

> I feel the most outstanding event took place Friday afternoon, June 27th. This T-group session I consider the most open session since everyone was involved and feeling a strong unity, cohesiveness among the group members. Everyone cried and one member who had been outside the group, finally became a part of the group.
>
> The last day of the 2 week session, we confronted the

problem of conflict in the T-group. Saw how both sides in the disagreement didn't fully realize and understand the others' feelings until they were entirely out in the open. I realized how unfair it is to make judgments based on assumptions. Now it's easier to see valid and possible working situations.

After a group "feeling" and trust had evolved for four days we came together on Friday feeling free and content. We didn't think that much else than a continuation of personal goal work could happen. Late in the day we were in a circle on the floor with hands held or arms around shoulders when a member expressed how sad the world was with its fake games, mistrust, hate, etc. Other members expressed their personal feelings and finally most of us cried. ("With a Little Help from my Friends" by the Beatles was on the record player.)

The first Friday afternoon I felt that for the first time, we were all extremely close, and honestly interested in each other. A couple of the members who hadn't said too much up to this point, expressed their feelings with special respect to the other members--we all ended up crying and just about as happy as we could be.

In responding to Item 2, several people wrote that "learning to formulate goals" was most important. One teacher's comments suggest that she was being involved in Human Relations work for the third summer. She expressed her satisfactions about what was for her the outstanding event. When the summer's task had been presented, she had been influential in getting her group to define goals instead of battling over who would be boss. Later, her group influenced the entire body. She wrote:

> My growth, i.e. increased self confidence on my part, enabling me to steer or guide my group to working on goal setting as a pre-requisite to decision-making and then total group following suit. Realizing how many skills I have acquired through two years of training.

Major learnings. Item 3 of the questionnaire was:

> List the major learnings that you have derived from this program.

Interns identified major learnings as "understanding of people" mentioned most times, followed by "becoming sensitive to myself," "becoming more independent," "learning to formulate goals," "other people have the same problems I do," "human emotion makes one feel good," "it's important to check assumptions," "others may not reach out to me for the same reasons that I'm not reaching to them."

Many interns wrote about how inadequate they felt.

One intern wrote about a wide range of perceived learnings:

> (1) That my conception of my outward appearance and role to others was seen differently than I thought it to be and it may really be a side of me, not a role. (2) That I don't dislike myself as much as I thought. (3) That I cannot be totally open with others (I still don't completely trust). (4) That I don't deal directly with hostile feelings to others (I suppress them). (5) That I can't completely break down (cry) in front of others. (6) That I can give to others. (7) That I can gain from others. (8) That I can withhold judgment of others and myself.

Another intern wrote:

> (1) Many people are more trustworthy than you give them credit for. (2) I'm insecure. (3) I feel inadequate. (4) I've got to be more open.

Interns and teachers differed with respect to responses on major learnings. Interns mentioned learning about others most frequently. However, the most frequent response by teachers mentioned learning about themselves, their emotions and "how I come across to others." The second most frequent of teachers' comments dealt with learning about others and learning interpersonal and organizational skills.

Major disappointments. Participants were asked:

List in outline form your major disappointments with this program.

Interns noted disappointments with other people, with themselves, some with the fact that their trainer had to leave after a week to work at a previous commitment, some with "lack of structure" to the program, and, as some termed it, "interference" caused by the introduction of the task. Some of these comments suggest that none of the program objectives were reached.

> That the T-group time was interrupted by program planning, making the sessions difficult to build from and progress from. That the trainer was changed after one week causing a serious setback; the group literally started all over. I never got help with hang-ups I have and would like to cope with (lack of time and perhaps a lack of openness on my part). I did not gain as much as I could have by not allowing myself to take on other experimental roles and behavior (lack of time, switch in leader, group division.)
>
> I did not learn as much as I hoped about myself. I was not able to open up sufficiently. Kept many feelings inside. Lacked trust. Not enough results. Sensed that many ends were not secured. 4 week program. Lack of knowledge about professional semester.
>
> People are not sensitive to other people's needs. The T leaders (some) are not open.
>
> There was not enough interaction between groups--many of the members grew to trust the people in their group so fully that we were hesitant to reach out to people in other groups. More time would have been helpful.

Some interns complained that some people were "too hung-up on need for structure." Others complained of too "short time for T-ing."

Teachers seemed also to be disappointed mainly that there was "not enough time spent T-ing." Other disappointments were "lack of communication between groups" and "difficulties in separating tasking and T-ing."

III. THE FOUR-WEEK EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER SCHOOLS

The Program

Teaching teams composed of from three to five teachers and interns worked with small groups of pupils who came to school mornings only. In one school intern-teacher teams worked on developing primary-age children's reading skills through various media. This included learning to read or improving reading skills through art, music, outdoor activities, mathematics, science and drama. Other teams helped children create their own program. They were not restricted to the classroom. As a result children worked out-of-doors and made field trips.

In a school for intermediate-age children there were programs concentrating attention on science, art, creative writing, and mathematics. One intern-teacher team helped students create a science program. The outcome was a mock "flight-to-the-moon" which took place at the same time as the NASA flight. In developing this program pupils studied ecology, mathematics, creative drama and writing, nutrition, sight and sound and art. They made a spaceship and videotaped their simulation of a lift-off while hearing and viewing the real lift-off on television. Another group worked at art all morning and were astounded to find that 9- and 10- year olds could sustain interest for three hours as well as turn out exciting products. The math group studied math and ran a refreshment stand along with usual math activities. The creative writing group found that boys as well as girls enjoyed writing especially when there was something groovy to write about. All the other groups helped the science group on their "flight to the moon."

Two interns felt that they could better meet their own learning objectives by working in the environmental education and migrant programs being held at the same time in South Brunswick. During the last week of the program, these two interns acted as consultants on environmental education to the cooperating teachers and other interns.

In the afternoon, the teaching teams had various activities. They diagnosed and evaluated their morning work, often using a consultant to help critique. They planned ahead, organized committees to secure materials, and met with various consultants. It was the responsibility of the teams to make appointments with the consultants and to determine how the consultants could be of most use or help to them. Consultants were also called upon to help with interpersonal issues.

The NTL Institute consultants also conducted voluntarily attended sessions in consultation skills, goal-setting and systematic problem solving skills. One consultant took the responsibility of arranging for videotaping and analyzing learning episodes. Some teaching teams made use of videotaping to help children diagnose and analyze themselves. The consultant also trained experienced teachers to become proficient in helping other teachers and interns evaluate their work.

The college supervisor served as a reading consultant and assisted interns and teachers in using other consultants. She also had defined as a goal for herself that of increasing her consultation skills. One technique she used was to call in a trainer to observe her during a consultation session where she was the consultant. The trainer observed and helped her to critique the session.

In the last week of the four-week segment of the program, two general sessions were conducted by the NTL Institute consultants to help people get ready for the school-year. Each intern and teacher did a force field analysis of his strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. Each wrote specific personal goals for things he wanted to learn during the coming year. He also wrote out situations in which he worked best and the areas of interest to him. Examples were, "I work best in an informal setting," or "I need a more structured classroom," or "I like to work with older kids," or "I'd like to work in a classroom where instruction is individualized." These data were shared on large sheets of oak tag as teachers and interns milled about in a gymnasium. Teachers and interns interviewed each other and decided upon tentative working teams for the coming year. Once this connection was made, the teams met with the Newark State College supervisor and a South Brunswick project director and discussed why they formed this team. Goals were reviewed.

What constituted a team varied. In some cases a team consisted of one teacher and one intern who would work together the entire semester. Other teams included more than one teacher and one intern or vice-versa. In one case the resource teachers of a particular school acted as the cooperating teachers for a group of interns and the interns worked in various classrooms and situations such as working with the learning disabilities specialist. The resource teachers acted mainly as consultants. The resource teachers did not have their own classrooms.

(In Crossroads School, later in the summer, the principal asked a

committee of teachers and interns to prepare a design for matching interns with teaching units. The committee conducted a session whereby each unit as a whole and each intern interviewed each other. They then gave the principal their ranking of the opposite number they would like to work with. The principal gave final approval.)

Reports Gained at End of First Week (July 11)

During the summer a number of instruments were used to secure participants' reports of impressions. Data reported here were gained at the end of the first week (July 11), at the end of the second week (July 18), and at the end of the summer. Greater focus is given here to interns' expressions than with teachers'. Reports suggest that more of the objectives of the program were attained.

How the teams worked.* At the end of the first week of the four-week experimental school, teachers and interns were asked to check items on a six-point scale referring to how their teaching team operated. Means of teachers' and interns' impressions are listed below beside each item. (1 low - 6 high)

	Teachers	Interns
1. Trust	5.0	5.1
2. Openness	4.8	4.8
3. Genuineness	4.8	5.1
4. Understanding	4.3	5.1
5. Acceptance of each other	4.8	5.2
6. Listening	4.9	5.2
7. Shared decision making	4.3	4.6
8. Planning	4.5	5.3

*These and other data were fed back to participants during the summer.

	Teachers	Interns
9. Decision making	4.5	4.9
10. Processing of "how we work"	4.0	4.1
11. Have been fully utilized	4.6	4.3
12. Have-have not held back expression of feelings	4.4	4.5
13. Learned a lot re my teaching effectiveness	4.0	4.2

Interns' ratings were higher for all items except item 11 referring to the extent to which the person felt he had been utilized. This finding supports written reports by interns that they held back at the beginning of the four-week school. Greatest discrepancies between teachers' and interns' ratings occurred for items 4 (understanding) and 8 (planning).

Goals and hindrances. The teachers and interns were also asked to write a goal that they had set for themselves and then to write on what hindered them in working toward this goal. Most of the interns' goals dealt with "developing confidence" in working with the pupils, "getting to know the children," and "being more confident in subject area." Next, in order of importance to interns was a complex of goals like "working better with colleagues" and "having effective cooperation within the team."

Hindrances also expressed by interns as dealing with self in relation to working with pupils are:

> My unsureness. My fear of not knowing what to do if our plans were not successful.
>
> I didn't know how to get the children started at some activity.
>
> My inexperience.
>
> Being an intern, I don't feel as confident yet and have let the teacher lead the class.

As was true with goals, a second set of hindrances was related to the team:

> Lack of correlation within the group hindered the realization of this goal.
>
> Too many ideas and not enough coordination.
>
> Team member X is not as uninhibited as Y.
>
> Team-mate in creative writing had T-group meeting and afternoon commitments. This afternoon will be our first time together for feedback.
>
> Dependence of interns on teachers.
>
> Our lack of good planning, our lack of clear knowledge of the shorter attention span of the younger children.

The pupils also were perceived as offering hindrances to some people's achievement of their goals:

> Not being able to do it with every child; having to give attention to other children when needed; the child became tired; other children shunning reading (they wouldn't read or didn't want to when asked to; other activities seemed to interrupt the process.)
>
> Had to build trust with each student--knowing what they are like before any analyzing could take place.
>
> At the beginning, none of the kids wanted to do anything I suggested and they had absolutely no suggestions of their own.

Teachers also focused on the pupils, but their concern was more for the pupils' learning. Some teachers also expressed goals in terms of helping with interns, with comments like, "getting the interns actively involved."

Reports Gained at End of Second Week (July 18)

Satisfactions. After two weeks of the experimental school program, the teachers and interns were asked to write responses to:

> List your greatest <u>satisfactions</u> on the job during the last two weeks. Be specific:

Both interns and teachers made most references to satisfactions gained from feelings of competence in working with the pupils.* Representative comments by interns follow. Most of their responses show a sense of real excitement. Many also appear to demonstrate growth--or at least, clarification, of their self-concept--as teachers:

> The kids became very involved and enthusiastic while working on our space project. I enjoyed watching and helping and encouraging, knowing that the whole thing was theirs.

> Getting to know the kids as individuals, some of my lessons were very effective. I found this out by having the children explain to the class what they learned that particular morning.

> The first phase of our science program came to fulfillment and the children came through beautifully.

> We really accomplished a lot. The kids were very excited about our science program. We worked together, kids and teachers, and developed an exciting space project. I learned so much from the kids--they put so much into the program. I'm proud of the way things went.

> Having the children plan the daily activities with us; a parent came in and told us that she asked her daughter what she liked about the program and she said it was that she--for the first time--worked with the teachers; the freedom which we have to work and experiment in without having the threat of failure hanging over our heads; working with small groups of children.

Teachers' comments on gaining satisfactions also were derived mainly from working with pupils. Teachers appeared to be most happy with the

---

*Many interns' responses contained references to satisfactions gained from other sources, e.g. colleagues, but in every case, interns wrote of work with pupils first.

informality and flexibility of the program, and the fact that pupils were becoming more self-directed. Some typical comments follow:

> The kids asked to learn division and were attentive while I was trying to teach it to them; the kids are beginning to suggest things to do rather than just asking me what I want them to do; we made brownies and they all worked together extremely well--they took turns and all helped with cleaning up.
>
> The way the children in my group are working together rather than against each other; the part which they (students) take in the planning of what goes on in our room; the film on creative dramatics; the cooperation of the staff members.
>
> Doing enormous construction work with the kids; having typewriters available for those who want it or need it; being able to send the children off with another teacher to do something that interests them; having all the materials we need.
>
> I like the informality of working during the summer; I enjoy working with the smaller group because it takes less time to develop a rapport with the children; working on a one to one basis I can tell better whether or not I am reaching the children.
>
> Developing a working relationship with the children; being able to share experiences with my fellow workers and learning different teaching techniques; being able to effectively work with my teammate with little conflict and good decision-making implementation.

Although many teachers and interns used the video equipment to critique lessons, only one teacher isolated the use of videotape as a source of satisfaction. The response was listed along with other satisfactions. This teacher wrote:

> Micro-taping a lesson and being able to review it with the children and other teachers; being able to communicate openly with others concerning classroom problems and criticism; taking children to a museum and their reactions to the materials they saw; being able to partake in physical education with the children.

Next, in order of frequency of mention by interns were satisfactions gained from interactions with the other adults. Representative comments are:

> Getting along with my two team members. We're able to share ideas and plan together.
>
> T-ed with teacher and intern I'm working with and solved many things which were previously unsaid. We are now more open with each other--about our teaching techniques and personal feelings.
>
> Openness between myself and my cooperating teacher; interchanging ideas with other sections of the math group.

Similarly, the teachers' next source of satisfaction was expressed as gained from working with other adults. Several of the teachers specifically mentioned satisfaction gained from interns' progress:

> Intern took over class leadership on assigned day as well as two other days when teacher was absent. She conducted her program well. The student response was enthusiastic and involved.
>
> Getting to know everyone and especially the interns in the science group. They've done a lot of work and have used constructive suggestions to improve their teaching; this summer's program is much more organized and interesting than the 1967 summer program. Teachers know more about what is expected from them and they know better how to accomplish more of their student and individual goals; a workable group--no personality clashes--we can resolve our problems by talking about them like intelligent human beings.

Dissatisfactions. Another item on the instrument used was:

> List your greatest dissatisfactions on the job during the last two weeks. Be specific.

Teachers stressed interpersonal and organizational difficulties somewhat more than the interns did, although for both groups this area

gained the greatest frequency of mention. Interns wrote:

> I witnessed hurting and using individuals to teach others a lesson; I saw a leader scared and threatened; I feel distrust for unknown people in a sensitivity-trust program who stoop to gossip at the expense of hurting people's reputation; I want to be more tolerant.
>
> As the project progressed, one of us became too involved and at times I felt left behind--not completely involved in planning as I didn't know everything that was going on.
>
> Lack of human relations and communication with entire group.
>
> Our group (composed of 3 interns and 2 teachers) began working together but one person began to dominate the program. He got so excited about our project that he started telling the children what to do instead of giving them the opportunity to explore and experiment themselves. I think we've gegun to resolve this difficulty. We're confronting the problem as a group--not individuals.
>
> Lack of communication and honesty among us in family meetings; lack of supplies, alienation of certain groups--namely art.
>
> I have not taken as active a role in a teaching situation as I would have liked. There were some problems in my group that put somewhat of a damper on things.

Teachers expressed interpersonal and organizational difficulties in this way:

> One of the team members has to be made more aware of doing things on a group level and not on an individual level. I wanted to be more involved in the Science NASA Project but not enough responsibility was delegated to me nor could I assume it, as the program was mainly centered around one intern--but we have discussed this in our group and are working to resolve the problem.
>
> The inability to cope with individuals with opposing viewpoints and principles. I've failed in this aspect and feel very bad about it.

> Family meetings (entire school staff)--poor planning--at times these are a waste.
>
> Lack of communication between groups; family meetings; being unable to work with other children; the heat.
>
> Not fully realizing or reaching my goals and objectives; the inability of the family to function effectively as a group, as evidenced by a lack of human relations.

After dissatisfactions expressed with respect to working with colleagues, there were next in number of responses comments of dissatisfactions gained from working with pupils. However, most interns' responses about dissatisfactions re working with pupils appear to suggest growth-producing possibilities:

> Gave a lesson on "cats" to entire group. They were not ready for it so they tuned me out immediately which really hung me up because I should have known they wouldn't understand it. After discussing this with my group, I found where I had gone wrong and think I have corrected it in follow-up lessons.
>
> I liked the way I was relating to the kids and now I have to think more about this--to be in a role that should be changed is bothering me. Also, I've gotten too excited about the first phase of our science project and after seeing the videos--I could see that I tried to run things a little too much.
>
> I'm not able to work my tape-recorder but I'm learning. I didn't feel as confident as I would have liked to when doing a lesson.

The following dissatisfactions expressed by teachers also demonstrated potentially useful self-diagnosis. One teacher wrote:

> The kids asked for a worksheet on which they wanted problems with division and multiplication which I had been "teaching" them all week. I made up a worksheet and they got many of the problems wrong.

Another teacher noted as her dissatisfaction, "being unable to get my kids to express thoughts on paper as well as they do verbally."

One teacher did not include herself or colleagues in her statement of dissatisfaction. Her concern was for a pupil. This teacher wrote: "There is one kid who has not opened up and is still uptight about school."

Reports Gained at End of Summer

Summary evaluation. When interns were asked to write an anonymous completion to "The Intern Program for me was...," all but two of them wrote things like, "GREAT!" "Fantastic," "the Greatest," "a worthwhile experience." More specifically they saw their own growth; they enjoyed having a hand in the planning of the program, some "found teaching," and they learned about themselves and others. They wrote, for example, these comments suggesting both personal and professional growth:

> A fantastic experience. I never experienced so many new different, unbelievable situations in my life. I met and got really close to some great people whom I hope to remain friends with for a long time.
>
> Great. It was real. Unlike things back at Newark State. I'm sorry it's almost over already. I really loved the first 2 weeks of sensitivity training.
>
> Enlightening! Not only did I learn "practical" aspects of teaching and working with children, but I learned more about myself and people as to what makes them tick, hang-ups, etc. This has helped me to look more objectively at people, children included.
>
> A most valuable experience. It gave me a chance to work as both teacher and student, but mostly teacher, and the chance given to me was the most important, so far, in my career.
>
> A chance to gain a feeling of personal worth. I met many new people and made two close friendships. An opportunity to realize that teaching is not a job but a profession.

A fabulous experience in learning to work with people. I'm not going into student teaching cold--the building is familiar to me, some of the kids I know--however I may not get them. I recommend this program to others.

Very profitable. It gave me the opportunity to work with children as a teacher, and also the opportunity to plan within a team of teachers.

Helpful in helping me see myself as a teacher by gaining experience with kids. It has also helped me see myself as a person and how others perceive me.

Very helpful in determining my goals (personal and professional). It was stimulating in giving me an opportunity to work with intermediate grade children.

Stimulating. Helpful in giving me some confidence. In short, helped me to fulfill my personal goals.

A true learning experience. I gained much more knowledge of what teaching should be in the past three weeks than I have in school. The teacher's guidance in planning and honest feedback were invaluable. She taught me the need for setting objectives, planning, and evaluating classroom activity.

The two interns who did not feel so happy with the program, summed up their six weeks as follows:

> Both disappointing and profitable. The T-group sessions helped me tremendously in learning to trust and "open up with people." But I found that this openness was lacking in my relationship with my team in the reading program. I was disappointed with the teacher and a couple of interns I worked with. But I guess the past few weeks will be profitable when I learn from the mistakes that were made.
>
> Very confusing. At times I felt it was very unrealistic and damaging. A great deal of personal, individual feelings seemed to be overlooked in order for the group to learn a lesson.

All but one of the teachers wrote that the intern program was a positive, rewarding experience. Most of the teachers wrote comments that suggest that they, themselves, gained a good deal from working with the interns. An elementary teacher described the contributions the

intern made in terms of increasing the resources available to the classroom.

Teachers' written comments at the end of the summer revealed a feeling of having done something worthwhile:

> exciting, informative, and enlightening regarding myself.
>
> rewarding and exciting; it has helped me to know people in a better way.
>
> enlightening and interesting. I enjoyed being a semi-cooperating teacher.
>
> enriching. Through pupil-teacher and teacher-teacher contact I have become aware of a number of innovative techniques.
>
> rewarding in that I had the opportunity to meet others in my field and also gained some extra classroom experience.
>
> useful in that I discovered some methods of teaching which could be considered creative. It also gave me the confidence in my ability to come up with useful methods.
>
> educational and broadening. I have been exposed to a variety of approaches and feel more relaxed with myself and others.
>
> very beneficial in getting to know new personnel for the school year. New techniques and ideas were also learned.

A new teacher who was part of the summer program but who would not work with an intern during the school year wrote:

> helpful to me in the sense that I worked in the Math area in which I am weak. It was a challenge for me. In the beginning I was quite unsure of myself but as time went along I got in the groove and have helped my students.

Some teachers wrote about personal gains:

> personally rewarding and offered me opportunity to know myself. It allowed freer interaction with colleagues and offered unlimited opportunity for experimentation in techniques and approaches in working with children.
>
> quite a learning experience. I learned a lot about myself. What my strengths and weaknesses are and how they would

> effect my teaching. I gained a lot of helpful teaching hints and was made aware of certain pitfalls. I was glad I had the opportunity to find these things out before I started teaching.

Teachers are. The stem, "Teachers are . . .," evoked an almost universal response from interns for teachers being helpful and interested in, understanding of and sympathetic toward interns. Teachers were described in this way:

> Helpful. I was really surprised and impressed that they were so willing to help and interested in us as future teachers.
>
> Helpful as you'll let them be. I now realize how much more I could have gotten by consulting with them and critiquing what I have done.
>
> Helpful, stimulating, interesting and gave you a feeling of being their equal.

Most teachers completed "Teachers are" by describing themselves as normal, human beings, helpful, honest and cooperative:

> enthusiastic people with new ideas who are fun-loving but yet serious in their outlook on life.
>
> much more relaxed and informal than during the year and I think freer with ideas.
>
> on the whole cooperative, understanding, and interested in self-improvement.
>
> very honest and open. I feel however, that last years' group of teachers were more interested in the program.
>
> out to learn and give.
>
> open and willing to give and accept criticism as well as ideas.
>
> friendly and helpful. There is none of the feeling of "this is my idea and you can't use it." Teachers are sharing ideas and brain-storming new ways of doing things.

helpful and sharing

cooperative

Only a few teachers wrote criticisms of themselves as a group:

unconcerned, not understanding, not as helpful as they could be. Cliquish.

often authority figures but are becoming less so, which is wonderful.

Interns are. A wide range of responses were evoked when interns were asked to complete the sentence, beginning "Interns are." However, many comments suggest that feelings of inadequacy cannot be overcome in six weeks. The realistic note appears to be rung again. Some wrote:

inquisitive, scared, and eager to learn.

eager to know things but afraid to ask.

friendly, experimenting, anxious.

not always sure of what to do or how to do but after I reviewed what my team did I feel that the time has not been wasted and that I am capable of being an independent teacher.

On the other hand, some wrote:

primarily more sure of themselves now than they were in the beginning. We have acquired some experience beneficial toward better cooperation between teacher-intern.

More at ease with the participants in the program, but have difficulty keeping things in the realistic perspective away from the program.

And one intern stated:

fortunate to be able to participate in such a program. The experience gained here has been more valuable than any I have gained in a college classroom.

Positive comments written by teachers about interns were:

> great. Their enthusiasm is catching and their problems help me to understand how to work with others of their age.
>
> anxious individuals who actually are more competent and have more to offer than they think.
>
> very creative and capable when they are able to feel more secure about themselves.
>
> very relaxed and easy to relate to.
>
> helpful in evaluation of self; fun, fresh and original
>
> helpful, easy to work with, sincere, concerned.

Giving feedback to interns. This stem caused most interns to feel "like I can help," "I am helping them achieve the things they wish to gain. I don't feel I am criticizing them, but rather helping."

Giving feedback helped other interns feel they could speak their own mind, trust their own ideas:

> Like I have gained something from expressing myself; not self-satisfaction, but a deeper trust in my own ideas.
>
> valuable to the program since we may have some of the same problems.
>
> makes me think about the problem--fulfilling one of my goals and by giving them feedback, I can better solve my problems.

Giving feedback to teachers. This stem made some interns feel like more of an equal:

> more of an equal to them. I've learned an awful lot about people from this program; and a teacher is a person.
>
> much more equal than I had expected. Back at Newark State I always thought that a teacher was a superior authority figure during student teaching. I'm glad I found out differently.

much better now than before. I feel that they listen to what I say as something pertinent and worthwhile.

But giving feedback to teachers caused other interns to feel less good:

like an idiot! How can I reach an experienced professional and tell them how I feel about them when I am so inexperienced myself.

It is sometimes resented and not taken as seriously as when this feedback is given from fellow teachers.

that I'm not supposed to be doing it.

A few teachers described interns as insecure:

insecure, but yet willing to work to find out what they really want.

wonderful people who sometimes need guidance, love, and attention to find the correct part or paths for themselves.

sometimes inhibited by feelings of inferiority which may prevent them from utilizing their full abilities.

About giving feedback to teachers, the teachers wrote this made them feel good:

helpful. At least I proceed on the basis that I am perceptive enough to give helpful feedback.

dedicated and excited about education.

helpful in that I am aiding another to become more professional.

made aware of my own inadequacies and strong points.

like perhaps my opinion, suggestions, criticism, or whatever might be helpful, supportive, evaluative.

Okay

good

Only two teachers felt uncomfortable:

as though I'm trying to act superior or have had all

experiences.

ambivalent, it depends on the teacher.

About giving feedback to interns, again, most teachers felt good about this:

> helpful, I am hopeful of being encouraged to those who want, or think they want, to teach.
>
> as if I'm giving help and in some cases constructive criticism.
>
> dedicated and excited about education.
>
> good. I feel like I'm helping.
>
> important and helpful.
>
> accepted and worthwhile.

Only three teachers wrote comments that demonstrate possible discomfort:

> ambivalent, it depends on the intern.
>
> uncomfortable because I found that it was sometimes difficult for them to accept both positive and negative feedback.
>
> like a teacher instructing a child. If the discussion can be between several people (interns and teachers) it is more useful. Then I am not the "teacher" with a student.

When responding to the question as to how they feel when receiving feedback from teachers, almost half of the teachers say they feel "people care for me," or "are interested in me" or "want to help me." On the other hand, when referring to their feelings when receiving feedback from interns, only one out of 26 teachers who responded to this question wrote they feel "the person is interested in me."

Force field analyses. A study of the cards on which the force field

analyses of the teachers and interns were written at the end of the summer shows that more facilitative forces were described in what may be called professionally desirable terms, "open to new ideas," or "creative," "intelligent." More personal positive forces were also mentioned, covering a wide range, such as "compassionate," "accepts criticism," "calm," "flexible."

The inhibiting force mentioned most was "lack of knowledge or experience." The personal inhibiting force named most frequently was "impatient." Other inhibiting forces mentioned were "liking to do things my own way," "lazy," "indecisive," "apologize too much," and "unsure of self."

Only a few teachers and interns wrote inhibiting forces that did not describe themselves as passive or dependent. Three wrote "do things own way." Two wrote "impulsive," and one wrote "authoratarian."

IV. THE FULL-SEMESTER TEACHER-INTERN TEAMS

The Program

The interns spent an entire semester working with the teams that had been formed at the end of the summer. The semester's work was composed of teaching, consulting, being observed, and seminars. The interns, teachers, and college supervisor cooperatively created a teaching program based on the learning goals of each intern. The outcome of this was that each intern had a unique teaching program designed to meet his goals. When a specific problem arose either with regard to the teaching program or with regard to an interpersonal issue, the intern and teacher met with South Brunswick staff members, the college supervisor, or an NTL Institute consultant in an attempt to resolve the problem. Interns consulted each other and met regularly to discuss problems. Interns were observed by the college supervisor, cooperating teacher, other interns and, sometimes, the building principal or an NTL Institute consultant.

The interns wrote out their individual objectives. They specify terminal behavior. They sought to make the objectives measurable. They suggested a time schedule for achievement of the objectives. The cooperating teacher(s) and the college supervisor reviewed the objectives with the interns, conferred on how best to achieve the objectives, and considered ways to evaluate attainment of the objectives.

Seminars were developed on the basis of the needs and specific objectives of the interns and teachers. Topics dealt with in these seminars were: classroom discipline and child development, personal and pupil evaluation, furthering skills in goal setting, ways to develop a problem-solving approach to teaching, innovative ways of correlating math with

other areas, intern-teacher conflicts, intern-intern conflicts, diagnosing pupils' performance, how interns' performance would be evaluated, how to plan for individualized instruction, and force-field analysis of teaching abilities. Arrangements were made to free the cooperating teachers to attend seminars. Where it was possible, internal South Brunswick resources, such as classroom teachers, resource teachers, and learning disability specialists, conducted the seminars. Other seminars were conducted by consultants from the college and the college supervisor.

Interns were granted eight credits for student teaching and eight credits for course work by the college. The course work was not evaluated separately from the student teaching. Instead, the program was viewed as sixteen credits of "learning." The evaluation was based on the specific objectives that each teacher-intern team created in collaboration with the college supervisor.[2] Throughout the semester, there was continuous, cooperative diagnosis and evaluation of each intern by the intern, cooperating teacher(s) and the college supervisor as a team. Toward the end of the program, the final evaluation was done cooperatively. The evaluation was based on how well and to what extent the intern achieved the objectives.

After the interns had completed their internship, a meeting was held at the college with the college supervisor. At this meeting, interns discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the program as well as recommendations for future programs. The interns also planned and conducted

---

[2] See: Alva F. Kindall and James Gatza, "Positive program for performance appraisal," Harvard Business Review, 41: 153-154, 157-159, 162, 165, November/December, 1963.

a meeting for prospective interns who will go to South Brunswick next year.

End of the Semester Data

Concluding conference of cooperating teacher(s), interns, and college supervisor. The final intern-cooperating teacher-college supervisor conferences of the semester revealed that the interns had been personally involved in a most profound way. For many interns the experience had afforded them the opportunity to think through important personal as well as professional decisions.

In addition, the conferences showed again how little confidence the interns felt in themselves at the beginning of the program. They said that at the beginning, "I had no confidence in myself," "I felt I wasn't adequate to do it," or "I was petrified about teaching."

The account of the following report on the conference of the cooperating teacher, the college supervisor, and Miss A, the intern, shows how little confidence she had at the beginning, how she suffered a traumatic day, but emerged feeling better about herself and clearer about wanting to be a teacher. Her added ability to evaluate herself is also seen. She said:

> I had no patience. For a while I was always screaming and yelling. I wasn't smart enough. Now I'm pretty good in social studies. I found a lot of resources in the school.

Her cooperating teacher added, "You learned to ask for things."

Miss A continued:

> I didn't have enough self confidence. I was nervous at first. I always have gotten nervous when I had to get up in front of a group or even talk with more educated people. And teaching, I always felt, was such a dedicated field. You had to get too involved. I remember my own

teachers in parochial school. They were so dedicated.

Miss A feels now, as she said in the conference, that she is firmer with the pupils, "not so wishy-washy." Miss A talked about her second tape, made to be analyzed. She wondered as she laughed if maybe she was now "sounding just a little too authoritarian."

For her the big chance came when, with the assistance of a resource teacher, she and a group of pupils, mostly boys, worked all one day in another room on their "interpersonal relations." "I even cried. Can you imagine my crying in front of a bunch of boys. But things got better after that. And now I feel great. And I am going to teach."

Another intern, Miss B, told of how she decided it was better for her to live in South Brunswick rather than at home, in spite of some opposition from home. She told of how she changed personally, then told of how she began to rely less on her cooperating teacher. From that she turned to how a seminar with a professor helped her to understand her relationship with the pupils in her class and finally she, too, reported that now she feels she wants to be a teacher. Miss B said:

> I can think and act for myself without feeling guilty, at home as well as here. . . . When my cooperating teacher was out, I had no one to turn to, so I dug in. . . . At first my lessons had no continuity to them. . . . I always thought I couldn't express myself with people or explain things to children. . . . Dr. P's (a college consultant) seminar was great for me. I was trying to have kids on my level. I was expressing my problems by taking things out on the kids. Now, I can stick to my guns with the kids. . . . I stunk in talk time (current events). I didn't know anything so I couldn't really get involved, now I listen to the news more. . . . I really never had a chance to be myself. I know where I'm going.

Although most of the interns talked at great length about their

feeling of change from their initial feelings of inadequacy, many also said they "never felt like a student teacher," contrasting their own deep involvement with reports by friends in other Newark State College programs and reporting that student teachers in their schools from other colleges came to them for help.

Some interns talked systematically about their learning objectives, how they sought to achieve them, and the data they secured to evaluate their achievement. Miss C, for example, discussed an objective she had defined during an earlier conference with the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor. The objective was "to decrease the number of times pupils asked the same question when I gave directions." She asked the cooperating teacher to observe her giving directions and give her feedback on the actual number of times pupils asked the same questions. As a result of receiving the data, Miss C reported, she realized, "I didn't have a plan. . . . I wasn't bringing directions down to the kids."

To measure the objective of having pupils increasingly perceive her as a resource to the class, another intern, Miss D, asked one of her cooperating teachers to interview a class she had taught. The intern learned from the feedback that the total class did not like the reading games she had had them do but that individuals did think she was most helpful with materials she had prescribed for them.

As a final example, the following excerpts from a conference show both a feeling of fulfilling certain goals and a feeling of making a contribution to the system.

In the conference, Miss E, indicated that she defined one of her goals as trying to clarify what she wanted to do next year, teach or go to graduate school. After a satisfying time in a classroom, Miss E and her cooperating teachers outlined a program which included working with a learning disabilities specialist (LDS), a school psychologist, and a social worker. She observed the LDS administer tests. She "read up on" two tests, administered them and wrote reports on the results. Under the guidance of the school social worker, Miss E served as a counselor to a high school pupil.

As Miss E told about these experiences, she noted that she was more interested in the emotional aspects of children's expression than she was in learning difficulty caused, for example, by perceptual difficulties. She said she wanted "to be able to do the Rorschach" and "really be able to do this counseling thing." She felt good about what she had done to date in her counseling work, but knew that a lot of what she did was "hit-and-miss." "I could have gotten more data," she opined. Comparing these experiences with working in the classroom, Miss E summarized, "I was able to deal with the children as a group, but I wanted to deal with individuals, I found myself having to give priority to the group." She felt, she said, she would like to learn more about the tests and understand more about why they are used. "They tell you something about a child. But you can't tell everything from a test. Tests are based on how that person (the test maker) defines what he's measuring." Miss E told of how she met with a parent of one of the elementary pupils and she described how she went about getting the data "without threatening the

mother." The LDS interjected that the data Miss E brought back "turned around our whole approach to working with this child."

Miss E talked a bit about her college career and her relative success as a student there, but here, she offered:

> For the first time I'm putting me into what I'm doing. I also see how I have changed in working with groups or individual pupils. At first, I confused children "liking me" with management. I think I gave approval to M____, (the high school girl) but more recently I feel I am helping her not just to change the outside, like a dress. She's getting a better image of herself!

Data on drawings of a classroom. Interns and teachers were asked toward the end of the semester to draw themselves in a classroom. The drawings of the interns and teachers made in the previous June and near the end of the semester, December, were analyzed.

A judge rated the drawings on a five-point-scale in terms of four dimensions: Teacher Emphasis, Teacher Initiative, Psychological Distance and Traditionalism.[3]

For inter-judge-comparisons it had been found that "correlations were somewhat low but deemed adequate. . . ."[4]

In a test-retest of one judge's ratings on 24 randomly selected subjects, it was found that there was a monotonic relationship between the ratings for each of the four categories when the Kendall Tau coefficient[5]

---

[3]"Continuation of Project #67-03566-0" South Brunswick Township Title III Report, 1969, Appendix, pp. 1-6.

[4]Ibid, p. 2.

[5]J. V. Bradley, Distribution Free Statistical Tests, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968, Chapter 13.

or the Goodman-Kruskal Lambda[6] were obtained. When the Wilcoxen Signed-Rank test[7] was used, there was a significant change for the category, Psychological Distance.

When the judge's ratings for June (before) were compared with December's (after) using the same tests, no changes were found in any of the categories. This finding may have been caused by the fact that the five-point scale caused many ties. Thus, we do not know whether there were no changes in the participants or whether the instrument and how it was used were not discrete enough.

Student teaching profile. During the final conference held by the intern, the cooperating teacher(s), and the college supervisor, the intern and the teacher(s) were asked to check off a Student Teaching Profile. This form has a five-point-scale on which to rate the intern on fifteen items related to teacher effectiveness. The interns and teachers were asked to rate each item in terms of how they viewed the intern at the beginning of the semester and how they viewed the intern now at the end of the semester.

The following results were obtained, using Wilcoxen's test.[8] Tested at the .05 level was the hypothesis that the distribution of the "before" scores by interns and teachers were identical. This hypothesis was

---

[6]W. L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963, p. 608.

[7]Bradley, op. cit., Chapter 5.

[8]Bradley, ibid.

accepted for the following items for the "before" scores:

does adequate planning

exhibits knowledge of subject matter

responds positively to suggestions

exhibits control of group

is flexible and adaptable

creates favorable classroom atmosphere

On the other hand, the hypothesis of similarity was rejected for nine items. In all cases the interns rated themselves significantly lower on the following items with respect to "before" scores:

is effective in oral communication

has a good relationship with pupils

has a good relationship with colleagues

uses skillful teaching techniques

projects a professional image

writes clearly and competently

shows enthusiasm and willingness to learn

plans effective for individual instruction

uses innovative ways of teaching

If these figures can be used with any degree of confidence, several observations suggest themselves. Most of the items where there was no significant difference between the teachers' and interns' ratings of the interns are items that suggest compliance with school's ways of doing things.

However the items in which there was a significant difference shown

between teachers' and interns' ratings, represent two large categories. One group is represented by the items dealing with: oral communication, relationship with pupils, relationship with colleagues. Perhaps the interns did not project outward how scared they really were. But they knew it. The other group of items dealt with technical competency to teach. Again perhaps the interns were aware of how little they knew at the beginning. Of course, another possible interpretation might be that the teachers are generally supporting people and enjoyed having the interns working in their classrooms, thus the inflated scores.

The end-of-the semester ratings were all nearly 5 and there was no significant differences for any of the items.

Conference with a principal. On the last day of the semester the Crossroads principal met with the interns in his school. He posed two questions:

1. What are the highlights of your stay at Crossroads? . . . . or perhaps another way of asking the question, what points do you talk to other students about?

2. What things would you change or what advice would you pass along to the next interns to help them get more out of their stay?

In response to the first question, on highlights, the interns said:

> The sixteen weeks are absolutely necessary. I've only recently gotten underway.
>
> The full semester gives you enough time to make mistakes, make corrections, and wind up feeling comfortable with the result.
>
> I had a chance to get involved more deeply in each of the four subject areas and with the four teacher techniques.
>
> The full semester allowed me time to get on my feet and then be able to get involved in after school-activities.

> I wouldn't have had time in 8 weeks, and the after school activities helped me see kids in a different light.
>
> My teachers were just super helpful.
>
> H.R. training helped me see myself. I set goals for myself, and I'm just overwhelmed that I've reached just about every one.
>
> Crossroads spoiled me. Where will I ever find another set up like this? I'm concerned.

In response to the question on what they would like to see changed, the interns told the principal:

> No one told me not to get too close to the kids. I tried to make friends for my own needs rather than help them for their needs. I know better now.
>
> I didn't get to see others teach the way I wanted to.
>
> I would have given myself a shorter experience with each unit teacher so I could get to see fellow Newark students teach and work with some elementary teachers.
>
> I wanted to compare 6th graders here with 6th graders in the elementary schools.
>
> I got so involved that on professional days I felt like I was deserting the ship.
>
> I needed more help in focusing on reaching personal goals previously established.
>
> We should have gotten together every 3 or 4 weeks to discuss my progress toward reaching goals.
>
> I changed my goals part way through and never stopped to record them. My unit teachers weren't even aware of the change.
>
> I couldn't be a student-teacher like I was. I was introduced as a teacher and accepted as one. My cooperating teacher assumed I could do things which I was unprepared to do.
>
> We need a seminar to help with seeking a job.

<u>How they worked</u>. At the final meeting of the interns for the semester the interns were given two forms to fill out. One form was a repeat of a

form used during the summer (See page 17).

Teachers individually were also asked to fill out these forms at their convenience at the end of the semester.

With a six-point scale, with six as high, the following means were gained. In comparing these means with the means gained in the summer, all the means are higher except for item 8 (teachers) on planning and item 10 (both interns and teachers) on processing 'how we work."

	Interns	Teachers
1. Trust	5.6	5.5
2. Openness	5.3	5.3
3. Genuineness	5.5	5.5
4. Understanding	5.2	5.3
5. Acceptance of each other	5.6	5.6
6. Listening	5.3	5.6
7. Shared decision making	5.4	5.0
8. Planning	5.3	5.2
9. Decision making	5.4	5.0
10. Processing of "how we work"	5.5	4.7
11. Have been fully utilized	5.7	5.3
12. Have-have not held back expression of feelings	5.6	5.1
13. Learned a lot re my teaching effectiveness	5.7	5.0

Interns' over-all reactions. At the final meeting interns were also given a sheet that read:

1. The intern program for me was:

2. What changes would you make in this program?

Interns' over-all reactions to the program were most enthusiastic and their suggestions for changes were direct, appropriate, and realistic.

> Great, because of its flexibility, the variation and amount of experiences that I was able to encounter and the freedom to make real decisions. Through no other experience, including my total three years of courses, have I learned so much about teaching, about children, about people and about myself.

The word that comes to mind is fantastic and a beautiful experience. I had an opportunity to build self-confidence in myself with working with children. I can't wait to teach my own class.

Great. It was an opportunity for me to find out what being a teacher was all about. I found that teaching is not just giving out information but finding out about children. The child, not the books, is the most important thing in a classroom contrary to what many methods courses and unit planning stress.

Great!! I am really glad I entered this program, and feel I have benefited greatly from it. It has made me realize how much I want to teach, and I have no qualms about entering a classroom next year which will be my own. Before this I wasn't sure I wanted to teach, but now I know it is definitely the profession for me.

The intern program was a great time for me. It helped me realize some of the potentials I have as a person and teacher. It helped me to gain some of the self-confidence I feel I will need as a classroom teacher. The program helped me to realize many of the individual needs and characteristics of children. This has been a very special experience for me and one of the most rewarding of my college career.

A wonderful and rewarding experience. I now realize many more characteristics of myself than I knew previously. I also learned how to distinguish the individual child's needs. In general, I learned more in this program than I learned in my 3 years at Newark State.

Very profitable. I learned much about people through this program and I feel I have learned to be more open--both with my peers and with children that I came into contact with. Before this program I did not know whether I could be a successful teacher--I had a tremendous lack of confidence--(because of a lack of experience). Now, however, I feel that I can become successful in a teaching situation and that I can give something important to children. I would recommend this program to anyone who wanted a very full student teaching experience.

Great! It afforded me an opportunity and the time to get comfortable in a classroom before "teaching" by being 16 weeks long. Through this program I did quite a bit of self-evaluation--resulting in a personal improvement. It allowed me to direct my own learning and have a voice in all

> that affects me as an individual. It gave me the freedom to choose what is best for me (this is what I think is best).
>
> Very worthwhile. Having the opportunity to pick my cooperating teacher and what grade I wanted meant a lot to me.
>
> The most exciting part of my college education. Being so extensive, it caused me to make a positive decision about teaching. I became totally involved and soon forgot that I was a student teacher. It is an experience I shall never forget and I am very grateful that I had the opportunity to participate in it.

Interns' Suggestions for Changes. Four main ideas were expressed by the interns. First they all suggested that the fall seminars should have begun earlier. Second, about half the interns also suggested that the seminars should be held at a time not to conflict with time the interns are in the classroom.

Third, another frequently mentioned idea was the expression of the need for more frequent and more consistent contact with the college supervisor.

Finally, some of the interns suggested earlier stress upon goal setting, more instruction in goal setting, and earlier setting up the mechanics for and of evaluation.

The following statements show these sentiments:

> Seminars should have been scheduled earlier in the program so more problems and experiences could have been shared with all the interns in the program. Also, Marie (the college supervisor) should have been more available for us just to talk about our everyday "doings."
>
> The only change that I would like to see made in the program is early scheduling of seminars and early goal setting. The only other change would be to have this program made into the standard interning program at Newark State, so that the entire student body could have a full semester of student teaching.

> Seminars should have started earlier. Contact with supervisors should have been more frequent. Better goal planning in evaluation. I would not change any of the concepts of this program--but I would structure the mechanics more efficiently.

Teachers' over-all reactions. Teachers were also asked to fill out the same form with the items, "The intern program for me was" and "what changes would you make in this program?" Teachers also expressed great enthusiasm for the program. They mentioned the interns' positive effect on their class' program and viewed the interns as professional contributors to their school.

> Most beneficial. Having the assistance of an intern was helpful in evaluating the class at the beginning of the year. Her aid, with reading and math groups especially, made it possible to get a smooth-running program underway. Exchange of ideas was an additional benefit.

> A very positive experience. I learned new ways of approaching topics from observing our student teacher. Due to our sharing of ideas and our experiences from the Title III (Summer 1969) Program, we both matured more in our professional growth. Openness, trust and honesty prevailed throughout the student teaching program because both parties were willing to achieve these standards.

> Made me think about my own methods and success as a teacher--I enjoyed working with someone just beginning in the teaching profession.

> The most successful of the three semesters of interns at Crossroads. Our intern was responsible, professional and hard-working. She seemed to have been better oriented as to what to expect. In every sense of the word she was a "fifth member" of our unit. She contributed more than her fifth of work and was respected by all.

> Very exciting and profitable. I learned a lot from my intern. She was very creative and original in her presentations. Her presence in the room freed me to work with small groups and individuals. The class gained by having a person in the room more competent in some areas than I am. I was able to individualize instruction to a greater extent because I felt my intern, having worked with me in the summer program,

> understood my goals and had plans and ideas as to how to achieve them. This experience benefited my intern, my class and myself.
>
> An exciting experience. I value the exposure to the interns with their recent school experiences and their fresh, creative approaches to learning. I appreciate the program for letting me share some of my feelings and knowledge in a manner that is informal yet helpful to the interns.
>
> A valuable learning experience, in that I feel I became more skilled in goal-setting and problem-solving techniques, and also more self-confident in my ability to work successfully with adults.

Teachers' suggestions for changes Most of the teachers' suggestions for changes also stressed the need for more contact with the college supervisor and earlier seminars. Several Crossroads teachers raised internal difficulties such as suggesting that interns should not be pulled out of the unit at the last minute as a substitute. A few teachers thought a pass-fail marking procedure would be preferable to the marking system employed.

> More guidance from Newark State so that the interns will understand how their performance will be evaluated. College supervision and communication with intern and teachers should rest with one person. More evident concern and coordination on the part of Crossroads administration.
>
> Student teachers assigned to a unit should not be allowed to fill the gap if other personnel are absent in the school. This last minute detail without any prior notification can create turbulent feelings toward other units and administration. No teacher likes to face her classes unprepared when she has a reputation for being otherwise. There should be better communication between the school system and the college.
>
> Begin seminars earlier; include some follow-up activities to reinforce and strengthen teachers' skills.
>
> Interns should be given more knowledge of goal writing and evaluation. A more generalized knowledge of the criteria with which the program is composed.

Interns should be allowed to realize the importance of such a program. Early time with which to become acquainted with the students involved and the school year operations.

I would suggest greater opportunity for communication between supervisors, cooperating teachers and interns. Workshops, meetings, seminars would be best planned for early in the program rather than after the student-interns have taken full control of the class.

V. DISCUSSION

On General System Goals

On page 3 of this report general system goals were outlined. These general goals were:

1. for teachers to improve their teaching,
2. for interns to learn to teach,
3. for pupils to attend good summer schools,
4. for an organization to be created so that these goals might be accomplished.

Achievement of these general system goals would be evidence that the ESEA Title III project goals had been achieved.

It is clear that the reports in the foregoing pages do not prove conclusively that these general system goals were met. The data-gathering instruments frequently were open-ended to the extent that data interpretation could not be focused on the goals. On the other hand, our experience has taught us that when we have sought goal-focused data the participants have "seen through" the instruments and used them to express all kinds of opinions. For example, when participants have gained some personal satisfactions from a program, they have responded to questionnaires and interviews in ways that suggested achievement of training program goals. Or when participants wished to express positive or negative feelings toward their administrators, they have used training program instruments to get their ideas across whether or not these ideas really related to the specific data being sought.

We have come to the belief that data secured during a training

program or just after a training program is fraught with possibilities for being fooled. Perhaps a saner data-gathering approach is to seek data three years or so after a program is concluded to determine whether a program has influenced a system. We have reason to believe that now that the organizational development program in the total South Brunswick system is several years old, data gathered now are more meaningful than first-blush data gathered some years ago.

Yet, we do not wish to hide behind a legalistic-sounding disclaimer. The foregoing information on participants perceptions does suggest that the general system goals were met--and more. Teachers did experiment with new ways of teaching during the summer. Beyond that, teachers', interns' as well as administrators' reports point to the fact that during the school year, instruction was greatly improved--mainly because of utilization of teachers' freedom to try different ways of teaching and because of effective utilization of interns' many resources.

The interns learned to teach. That is clear. They increased and improved their self concept. They learned to set goals, plan, and evaluate. They were encouraged to make mistakes in a non-threatening climate. They were challenged. They 'belonged." But more on this below.

The system goal was stated that pupils would attend good summer schools. The summer schools were good. Children's numbers literally increased as more children and parents learned of the exciting says of learning. Parents wrote unsolicited letters thanking teachers and interns because, as one parent put it, "for the first time Eric loves to read." Many months later the fabled "moon-shot" is being recalled as a fascinating experience. (No experience could have been more relevant for any

American child on the day Apollo-11 took off.) The flight and medical "apparatus" in the classrooms, the planning, the information used, the use of videotaping staggered the adults but for the pupils the "inter-disciplinary" study of a "moon-shot" seemed authentic.

This lesson was not lost on teachers and pupils. We have some evidence, not a lot, but some, that teachers have attempted to teach like this during the school year.

Finally, we feel that an organization was created so that these goals might be created. More on this below.

Specific Organizational Training Objectives

The specific organizational training objectives were outlined in this report on pages 3 and 4. It was hoped that a culture could be created so that participants would:

1. develop congruence between theory and practice,
2. increase skill in identifying and evaluating one's strengths and weaknesses,
3. develop skill in goal-setting,
4. increase openness,
5. increase skill in the use of resources.

Theory and practice. With respect to developing congruence between theory and practice, we do not feel this objective was met for interns to the extent it was met in last year's program. In last year's program the seminars were begun earlier in the semester and were viewed by interns as a most valuable part of the progrm for increasing congruence between

theory and practice.[9]

Moreover, in last years' program, all-day training programs were able to be conducted for teacher-intern teams, permitting them the opportunity to integrate theory and practice on such important organizational issues as goal-setting and evaluation.

On the other hand, in contrast to last year's program, more teachers attended this year's seminars. Thus, to a greater extent, they with the interns were able to examine theoretical-practical issues more directly related to teaching technologies. Teacher-intern teams raised with consultants problems that were troubling them. And consultants had the skill at once to relate these practical problems to theoretical constructs yet remain practical.

Evaluating strengths and weaknesses. In our opinion this specific organizational objective was achieved to an outstanding extent. The data presented in the earlier pages are filled with this fact. NTL trainers' introduction of the force-field analysis provided the total culture with a vehicle that was used again and again during the course of the program. The end-of-the-summer "mill" sharing force-field analyses (and other data) appeared to legitimate the idea that all people do have internal forces facilitating and inhibiting them from the goal of being a better teacher.[10]

---

[9]Robert Chasnoff and Claire Crawford, "South Brunswick intern program for Newark State College students," unpublished mimeograph paper, 1969.

[10]See: Matthew B. Miles, "Planned change and organizational health: figure and ground," Change Processes in the Public Schools, Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1965, pp. 24-25.

The significance of presence of teachers who had been through earlier training programs cannot be underestimated. They helped set the norms for openness about their strengths and weakness as well as giving others constructive feedback with respect to perceptions on how others came across.*

Goal-setting skill. Comparisons of early goals with the goals written toward the end of the semester indicate greatly increased sophistication. A systematic study is under way at present to compare goals, using Mager's[11] criteria (particularly as his book was used to a great extent to assist interns to improve their goal-setting skills).

Reports presented earlier in this report also indicate that both interns and teachers viewed goal-setting as significant learnings for them.

There was an interesting by-product of the emphasis on goal-setting for interns and teachers. Many of them reported that by struggling to write meaningful goals for themselves, they sharpened their ability to define better learning goals for their pupils. Indeed, several interns and teachers had pupils work at actually writing their own learning goals.

---

*This is an example of what we were talking about on page 51, 52. After three years these people are invaluable system resources. On-the-spot data gathering in the first year would not catch this.

[11]Robert Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives, Palo Alto, California: Feron Publishers, 1962.

Openness. The reports of the first two weeks of the summer program indicate great increase of openness. During the four-week summer school some of the openness diminished in some groups. During the semester there was generally a high level of openness. We are persuaded that after people engage in an HR experience, such as our two-week session, they must have opportunities to practice the new behavior, such as openness. We also believe that the early introduction of "the task," planning for the summer school, was important for permitting the carry-over from the two-week HR program into the work situation. It is true that some people reported they resented the intrusion of "the task" into their warm, closely-knit t-groups.

Perhaps we should have made our organizational objective on openness more explicit. We should have stated more clearly that on-the-job openness was our real goal. The hoped-for t-group openness then might be seen as a valuable means to that job-related end.

Use of resources. Consultants were chased after. There was none of the picture of recalcitrant teachers of obedient students trooping into in-service or pre-service meetings because someone else had decided what was good for them.

Participants' Recommendations for Changes

Both teachers and interns made crystal clear their feelings that there was not sufficient coordination with the college this past semester. In comparing this year's experience with last year, when there was more contact, the college supervisors too feel that the greater contact is the more useful. Our hope is that the college can make a greater

commitment in personnel in the future.

Moreover, in last year's program several training sessions for teachers, interns, and the college supervisor were held during the course of the semester. During these sessions, expectations, goals, and ways of working were made explicit. Teacher-intern teams were able to help each other with interpersonal problems. Teachers and interns were paid for their extra time for evening and weekend meetings. We certainly would have continued these meetings if our funds had not been cut after our plans for the summer program had been completed.

Another comment that many teachers and interns made was that they would have liked to see the seminars begin earlier. Those who have worked in the role of college supervisor agree.

Interns said that early they did not know how to "use the consultants." During the final end-of-the semester meeting, interns talked about this. They said that during the summer they did not think their problems were important enough to ask to talk to a consultant with. This feeling, they said, persisted into the beginning of the fall semester. Again, looking at our experience in last year's program, the early meetings of college supervisors with interns and teachers helped all see some possible uses of the seminars and all concerned were able to see the seminars as integral parts of the task of teaching better rather than "courses students have to take."

Some interns and teachers offered suggestions for change in the first two weeks. When some participants saw the introduction of the task of creating a summer school as a disruption of the t-groups, there was inter-group rivalry. Some argued for the election of summer-school

principals. They all saw how unclear their goals were. Some groups asked for help in defining goals. But others floundered. Our observation is that the introduction of the task was a precourser to what the summer would be like, a different kind of school where many of the typical ways of running a school were changed. HR specialists argue about whether to be task-oriented or interpersonal-oriented at first. Although the trainers attempted not to "spring" the task on the participants, and although there was much more trainer-client collaboration in the program than is ordinarily present, it seems possible that in the future, better collaborative planning with the clients might lead to increased clarity re: the total program's goals.

Implications. One of the ways of looking at this program is to note that institutional goals as well as individual goals were met. The South Brunswick school system had secured the Title III funds to carry out a creative program to improve education, and the intern program was conceived as a way to improve the South Brunswick program as well as to help Newark State College and the individual students.

Our feeling is that the South Brunswick teacher-intern program changed the curriculum in a positive way.

A most important ingredient of the intern program is that the investment of training, money, and time in the interns brought productive gains to the system. As we talked with the teachers and interns, they told us of the many ways the interns' presence in the classes permitted them to provide the pupils with a better program.

The flexibility the interns encountered in the system permitted

permitted them to influence the curriculum. In the elementary schools and in Crossroads, the teaching is individualized, and it is an individualized program that really works. For example, Crossroads units are scheduled to meet four times a week to plan for individual pupils. The elementary schools are staffed with resource teachers and learning disabilities specialists to assist teachers in designing for individual pupils. There is a system culture that supports individualized instruction. The interns, then, were useful additional resources. One intern created and introduced an art program in elementary schools that had no art program before.

The interns increased institutional productivity. In a system where the typical design for teaching is that of one teacher talking at a group of pupils, an intern would be less useful in increasing institutional productivity. The teacher would have to "stop teaching" while the intern performed. In the program we have described here, both adults often worked at the same time in the classroom, or one was in the classroom while another was elsewhere working with pupils or gathering materials.

Ordinarily, when pre-service programs are being designed, focus is of course, appropriate. We feel that in the present case interns' learning goals and the goals of the college were never compromised, but the interns had the additional advantage of seeing themselves as significant agents contributing to systems effectiveness. This they felt particularly when some of them went to a state conservation camp for a week with their classes, when they sat in on parent conferences, when they were paid as substitute

teachers when their cooperating teachers were absent, when they contributed to faculty meetings, when they were asked for feedback by the teachers, and when they saw pupils learn from programs they designed. And as we specified interns' own learning goals, they found it easier to talk about specific goals for their pupils. Indeed, several interns did goal-setting with pupils in the same way we did with the interns.

The system, then, was the client in this program, not the individual students. The students, in meetings and in casual conversations, frequently felt that they were members of the South Brunswick staff and not Newark State College students. Yet Newark State College and individual students' goals were certainly met.

We are frequently asked if we would recommend the kind of program described here for other students and for other systems. Our response to such a question is, first, that there is danger in tacking such a program on to a school system or a College of Education. Too many innovations are wasted that way. We would recommend that the program should be viewed in terms of the good the program can do for the system as well as thinking of serving the needs of the college or the students. Teachers and interns dealt with consultants as equals. Everyone benefited.

A greater use of resources by the South Brunswick system was the fact that interns were seen as adding enormously to the teaching staff. The data presented above shows this clearly.

Participants' Recommendations for Changes

Our feeling is that a program such as that described here is

particularly relevant in communities in which there is a real desire to break up the old bag of one teacher per classroom. For example, in some city schools, it would be appropriate to think of teams composed of teachers' aides, underclassmen, and interns as well as teachers. Given such a team, schools may be able to innovate some programs that would provide better services for their clientele. If the schools are unwilling to experiment, they should think carefully about instituting a program such as the program described here.

Our view is that an innovative system permits an Organizational Development program to help it. The program cannot instantly create a healthy system.

Implications for Pre-service Teacher Training and In-service Training

There can be a danger in such programs if the teachers and interns see them as times when the college supervisors lay down the law of what is acceptable. Teachers and interns, as well as college personnel, are accustomed to having professors knowing all the answers and all of them (including the college supervisor) can easily fall into this trap. All personnel involved, including the consultants and trainers, need to accept a collaborative model, whereby problems are defined together and solutions are tested. Such collaboration is possible with the college supervisors saying flat out what they would like to see happen and the school personnel, who are responsible for the school's program, making clear where they stand. (Such communication was made possible this year because the college supervisor was part of the system HR program. We would recommend this in all cases.) The interns, who are led to feel

like members of the school staff, and who certainly have a big personal and professional investment, must also be clear about what they need to do and cannot do, they must be treated as equals.

On page 30 of this report two teachers wrote comments that may well be the best summary to this paper. The comments suggest how much school experiences typically put down students and how their great talents and abilities can be released by a program such as that described here in a supportive system like South Brunswick. These teachers wrote about interns at the end of the summer:

> Anxious individuals who actually are more competent and have more to offer than they think.
>
> Very creative and capable when they are able to feel more secure about themselves.

We agree.

SYSTEM CHANGES AND PROGRAM INNOVATIONS

James A. Kimple
Superintendent of Schools
SOUTH BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Kendall Park, New Jersey

This paper was prepared for a Symposium entitled, "Curriculum Change through Organizational Change: A Human Relations Training Program in a School System," at the annual AERA meeting in Minneapolis, March 4, 1970. The project was supported by an ESEA, Title III grant #68-3566-1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SYSTEM CHANGES AND PROGRAM INNOVATION	2
Change in Individuals	2
Change in Schools and Teachers	3
The Intern Program	4
Summary	10

SYSTEM CHANGES AND PROGRAM INNOVATIONS

The training models used at Crossroads and the intern program have also been used with the elementary staff, and in working with joint student and teacher groups in the high school. HR work has been used with migrants and professional staff members in joint sessions.

Let me describe some changes in individual schools and curriculum as I have observed them.

Change in Individuals

I, as superintendent, was a member of the group for the first two weeks during the first summer. Several members of this group had real authority problems, most of them no longer do and as one stated:

> "I see the administration not as a threat, but rather as a resource to me. I can work without a sense of "Big Brother" watching over me and I feel the freedom to try new things."

Another, a member of the Crossroads Staff commented:

> "For the first time in many years of teaching I was able to become involved with people. These were not teachers to me, they were people whom I grew to know. I also regained a feeling of importance that I had not felt in recent years."

Last week, the husband of one of the Crossroads teachers reported how excited his wife was about the Crossroads individual performance appraisal in which she was involved along with other teachers and Fred, the school principal.

A member of the Board of Education, whose wife has worked as a substitute teacher is almost to the point of refusing to attend any social function with staff members since teachers talk only about youngsters and school work.

Sentimentalism, not at all.

Change in Schools and Teachers

The result of these close working relationships during the summer has carried over into the school year and broken down the barriers of the "egg crates" in which teachers work with some interesting organizational results. Let me cite a few examples.

Drew Stewart who teaches at Constable School was one of the guinea pigs in some video taped micro teaching sessions last summer. His performance and that of several other teachers was critiqued by themselves and a consultant from Lesley College. Drew learned micro teaching techniques and this year it is used extensively by the Constable staff as a means of improving teaching performance.

In other schools where strong cliques once existed the staffs have developed a real feeling of unity. Lunch hours, and any other free time will find groups or individuals consulting with specialists or discussing problems among themselves.

Teachers have learned how to use internal and external resources more effectively. Visitors at Crossroads are likely to be drawn into a teaching situation or into a consulting role with one or more staff members. Three teachers, engaged in independent research last summer, used Bob Chasnoff as a consultant and as a result of this consultation reworked their project. Two teachers (the only participants from one school) concerned about some internal problems, were able to bring NTL people in as consultants to the entire staff.

In preceeding years I've heard complaints about our special services staff. So far this year I've heard none, either from teachers or special

services people.

Until two years ago several teachers had refused to work and share with anyone. As a result of the intern program these same teachers now see practice teachers as valuable resources.

Last year 60 teachers participated voluntarily in a 30 hour reading workshop conducted by members of our own staff.

Several years ago parents were frequently blamed for their children's lack of progress. In fact some youngsters were condemned before they arrived in school. Parents are now generally seen as partners in the educational process.

Teachers frankly and openly assess each other's strengths and weaknesses when they place children in new groups.

Five years ago systematic collection and recording of information essential to individual prescriptions and progress evaluation was an unnecessary chore. Today the process is becoming more acceptable.

A systematic approach to problem solving was almost unheard of. Today many teachers use this technique, learned as a part of the summer.

Decision making about curriculum was a responsibility of "someone else." Today teachers are deeply involved in their own individual and group decisions.

The Intern Program

The success of the intern program has already been asserted. Several 1968 interns are now employed by South Brunswick. These new teachers walked in the first day with the poise and self assurance of veterans. They had teaching skills and information which most new teachers take 2 or 3 years to develop.

Three or four interns voluntarily withdrew from a teaching career. They discovered that they had neither the temperment nor the desire to work as closely with people as teaching demands.

I cannot attribute all that has occurred in the school systems to Human Relations Training and Organizational Development work. I do know that change has given a powerful impetus in 1963 by the joint experience at the National Training Laboratories.

Since 1963 the tempo and momentum have increased and a greater number of staff members have become committed and involved. In our attempts to solve some pressing problems we have generated a number of different approaches and significant programs. A brief description of some of these may provide a feeling for the scope of the operation undertaken by a professional staff of only 250. Most of them are involved in something which is significant to them and to the youngsters with whom they work.

Multi age, Heterogeneous Grouping

This type of school organization is now used, in total or in part, in each of our schools.

Individualized Instruction

Instructional patterns of diagnosis, treatment and prescription are becoming more common place.

Perceptual Development

We are deeply involved in gross motor, fine motor training in our K-3 program. Specially trained physical education teachers devote more than one half of their teaching time in this area. Expansion of this program is in the planning stage.

Pre-School Sensory Motor Development

A pilot program in one of our schools is a voluntary program for parents and children. Weekly seminars and actual work with children provide help to mothers in helping their children.

Continuous Conferences

The format for PTA meetings in one school is small group discussions involving teachers and parents. Education, children and school related problems provide the basis for discussion.

Family Centered Services

A multi service center with emphasis upon helping families learn how to help themselves has been instituted in connection with our Head Start, Follow Through and Migrant programs.

Vocational Training for Migrants

Drawn from a wide geographical area migrants are trained in an actual assembly line operation similar to that conducted for our own special needs students.

These units, housed in trailers, are now being used throughout New Jersey

Big Brother Program

Ninety Douglass College and Rutgers University students work with our youngsters on a regular basis. Originally designed for "disadvantaged" youngsters, many others now benefit.

Student to Student Program

High school, middle school and elementary students are actively engaged in classroom and outdoor education residency activities

with younger pupils.

High School Humanities Program

Conducted by Rutgers' students this program involves approximately ninety percent of the student body.

Program for Socially Emotionally Maladjusted

One teacher has 16 youngsters with responsibility and freedom to plan whatever program is needed for these students.

Differentiated Staffing

The youngster that needs help receives help almost immediately. Learning Disabilities Specialists have access to staff specialists and other resources necessary to meet individual needs.

Classroom aides have specific teaching assignments. Plans to expand and refine this program are currently underway.

Resource Personnel

Resource teachers, approximately one for every 12 elementary teachers, provide direct assistance to teachers and youngsters.

Voluntary Staff Participation

A number of staff members devote weekends to taking groups of students canoeing on the Delaware River, skiing, hunting and hiking. One teacher took a group down the Green River in Utah last summer, entirely on his own time.

Special Services

We boast an extensive special services staff and are presently working on finding more effective ways of using their expertise.

"Horizons for Youth" is a non profit school-community action

program incorporated by myself, an industrial consultant and a public relations director.

The thrust of "Horizons for Youth" is to provide a vehicle which will help suburban junior and senior high schools develop more meaningful programs for black and white students. This is a year round program. It has involved Harlem and South Brunswick youngsters. Last summer a group of 50 black and white youngsters spent 6 weeks in Utah.

This is our first attempt at organizing a coalition of city, suburb, industry, government and public schools in a common effort.

It should be noted that the foregoing description of organizational characteristics are completely devoid of "hardware" type investment. Our investment is in people.

Last year we wrote a novel approach to change into the contract with teachers. The Board of Education guaranteed summer employment to 25% of the staff at each instructional level. Teachers are required to initiate their own summer projects - write a proposal and submit it to a staff/administration board of review. Summer is retained as a vehicle for change.

Last summer 32 projects were submitted by individuals and groups. Seventeen were approved including:

> A Teacher Prescribed Diagnostic Program for Preliminary Testing and Sequential Follow-through in the Areas of Math, Reading, and Writing in the Elementary School.
>
> An Investigation of Possible Causative Factors in Poor School Achievement of Primary Level Children.
>
> Language Disability - A Program to Diagnose, Treat and Prescribe
>
> Workshop for On Site Development of Environmental Education Facilities.

To Begin the Development of a Unified Multi-Level Social Studies Curriculum for the Middle School Based on a Systematic Approach to Individualized Instruction

An All inclusive Design for Training; Organizing; and Implementing Diagnostic Procedures as an Approach to Better Coordinate the Developmental Physical Education Curriculum for the Physical Education Teachers.

The Development of an Ungraded Math Approach to the Teaching of Computational Skills at Crossroads School.

The Establishment of a Multi-media Learning Center at Cambridge School.

Data Processing Summer Project.

Educational Research & Evaluation of the Health and Physical Education Curriculum for the Improvement of the Program.

Continuous Progress Education in English for S. B. High School.

To Broaden the Goals of the High School Mathematics Program by the Use of the Continuous Progress Approach.

A Study to Integrate Black Studies in the Disciplines of Sociology, Economics, and Political Science.

SUMMARY

I may have given the impression that South Brunswick has found a way to solve all of its educational problems. Let me assure you that we haven't nor do we think that the training model as described will work in all situations.

We have described a demonstration project. For research purposes it has certain inherent weaknesses. Some of these weaknesses can be attributed to the fact that we were financially unable to employ a full time researcher: some are attributable to the lateness and uncertainty of funding.

I am convinced, however, that the model, combining organizational development work with a summer laboratory school holds great promise for change, not only in public school curriculum but in teacher intern programs and would have some validity in the Freshman year as well as later.

The model needs to be replicated as a research project with ample assurance that it will be funded for a three or five year period with ample provision for research. In fact, we should like to participate in such a venture since we need to go much further than we've been able.